COPYRIGHT ARBITRATION ROYALTY PANEL

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

HEARING

In the Matter of:

Adjustment of the Rates for | Noncommercial Educational | Broadcasting Compulsory | License |

Docket No. 96-6 CARP NCBRA

Library of Congress
James Madison Building
101 Independence Avenue, S.E.
Room LM414
Washington, D.C. 20540

Tuesday, March 31, 1998

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing, pursuant to notice, at 10:00 a.m.

BEFORE:

THE HONORABLE LEWIS HALL GRIFFITH, Chairperson THE HONORABLE EDWARD DREYFUS THE HONORABLE JEFFREY S. GULIN

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

APPEARANCES:

On Behalf of Broadcast Music, Inc.:

JOHN FELLAS, ESQ.

NORMAN C. KLEINBERG, ESQ.

MICHAEL E. SALZMAN, ESO.

of: Hughes, Hubbard & Reed, LLP

One Battery Park Plaza

New York, New York 10004-1482

(212) 837-6075 (JF)

6680 (NCK)

6833 (MES)

and

JOSEPH J. DiMONA, ESQ. (Asst. V.P.)

MARVIN L. BERENSON, ESQ.

Legal and Regulatory Affairs

BMI

320 West 57th Street

New York, New York 10019-3790

(212) 830-3847

On Behalf of ASCAP:

I. FRED KOENIGSBERG, ESQ.

PHILIP H. SCHAEFFER, ESO.

J. CHRISTOPHER SHORE, ESQ.

SAMUEL MOSENKIS, ESQ.

of: White & Case, LLP

1155 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-2787

(212) 819-8740 (PHS)

8394 (JCS)

BEVERLY A. WILLETT, ESQ.

ASCAP Building

Sixth Floor

One Lincoln Plaza

New York, New York 10023

(212) 621-6289

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

<u>APPEARANCES</u> (continued):

On Behalf of ASCAP:

JOAN M. McGIVERN, ESQ.
Assistant Vice President of Legal
Affairs
Office of the CEO
ASCAP
One Lincoln Plaza
New York, New York 10023
(212) 621-6289

On Behalf of the Public Broadcasters:

R. BRUCE RICH, ESQ.
JONATHAN T. WEISS, ESQ.
MARK J. STEIN, ESQ.
TRACEY I. BATT, ESQ.
ELIZABETH FORMINARD, ESQ.
of: Weil, Gotshal & Manges, LLP
767 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10153-0119
(212) 310-8170 (RBR)
8885 (JTW)
8969 (MJS)
8405 (TIB)

and

KATHLEEN COX, ESQ. (General Counsel)
ROBERT M. WINTERINGHAM, ESQ. (Staff Atty)
Corporation for Public Broadcasting
901 E Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-2037
(202) 879-9701 (KC)
9707 (RMW)

and

NEAL R. GROSS

APPEARANCES (continued):

On Behalf of the Public Broadcasters:

GREGORY FERENBACH, ESQ.,

(Vice Pres. & Acting General Counsel)

ANN W. ZEDD, ESQ. (Asst. Gen. Counsel)

KAREN C. RINDNER, ESQ. (Asst. Gen.

Counsel)

PBS 1320 Braddock Place Alexandria, Virginia 22314 (703) 739-5063 (GF) 5170 (AWZ)

NEAL A. JACKSON, ESQ.

DENISE B. LEARY, ESQ.

GREGORY A. LEWIS, ESQ.

Deputy General Counsel

National Public Radio

635 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20001

(202) 414-2000 (NPR)

2049 (DBL)

ALSO PRESENT:

GINA GIUFFREDA, CARP Specialist
TAMALA T. BOYD, Legal Assistant,
White and Case
ALBERT ALDERETE, Legal Assistant,
Weil, Gotshal & Manges, LLP

I-N-D-E-X

WITNESS		DIRECT	<u>CROSS</u>	REDIRECT	RECROSS
M. Peter	Downey				
By Mr.	Kleinberg		2223		
By Mr.	Rich			2285	
				2357	
By Mr.	Schaeffer				2322

Peter Jablow

By Mr. Rich 2360

By Mr. Schaeffer 2395

Voir Dire by Mr. Kleinberg on page 2486

Exhibit No.	<u>Description</u>	Mark Recd
<u>BMI</u>		
1X	Electronic Media 02-23-98	2240 2282
2X	Broadcasting & Cable 09-01-97	2267 2284
<u>PB</u>		
1	Cincinnati Inquirer 10-10-96	2298 2301
<u>ASCAP</u>		
18X	<u>Current</u> 03-02-98	2322
19X	<u>Current</u> 05-27-96	2423
20X	NPR web site printout	2446 2247
21X	Guidelines for Underwriting	
	of National Program Service	
	Programs	2455 2455
22X	PB Report	2460
312X		2476

NEAL R. GROSS

	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	(10:02 a.m.)
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Mr. Downey, good
4	morning.
5	WHEREUPON,
6	M. PETER DOWNEY
7	was recalled as a witness and, having been previously
8	duly sworn, resumed the witness stand, was examined
9	and testified as follows:
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Ladies and
11	gentlemen, good morning. Let the record reflect that
12	the Court Reporter has been previously sworn, and she
13	remains under oath; that the witness, Mr. Downey,
14	likewise has been previously sworn and remains under
15	oath.
16	Are there any preliminary matters?
17	I trust all of you went to see the cherry
18	blossoms last night.
19	All right. Mr. Kleinberg on behalf of
20	BMI?
21	MR. KLEINBERG: Thank you, Your Honor. I
22	probably have just several hours of questions about

1	underwriting and the like.
2	(Laughter.)
3	CROSS EXAMINATION
4	BY MR. KLEINBERG:
5	Q No. Mr. Downey, I think I can assure you
6	that I have taken the night to pare down what remained
7	of any questions that hadn't been asked to a bare
8	minimum. So it shouldn't be too much longer.
9	I do want to ask one question about the
10	subject of corporate underwriting/advertisement, and
11	it's more in the nature of a clarification, I hope.
12	As I understand your testimony, there are national
13	underwriting announcements that are distributed by PBS
14	with the programming that is in the National Program
15	Service collection, is that correct?
16	A That is correct.
17	Q And that goes to the member stations along
18	with the program?
19	A That is correct.
20	Q In addition, is it also correct that the
21	member stations themselves may add corporate
22	underwriting announcements to that programming as well?

1	A They can't put it inside the program.
2	They can't edit the program, but they can put it
3	adjacent to the program.
4	Q And so that the totality, if you will, of
5	corporate underwriting announcements is really twofold
6	with respect to the national program fee that is,
7	those that are already incorporated in the program
8	from PBS, and then whatever may be added in the way of
9	adjacencies by the member stations themselves?
10	A Yes. We have we have some rules here
11	that are important to point out namely, that if a
12	if PBS uses funds to acquire a program, which may
13	also have funds from a corporate underwriter, then
14	stations may obtain local underwriting for that
15	program because their funds were invested in it.
16	So a typical announcement might be the
17	costs of this episode of Nova are made possible in our
18	community by the XYZ company, and then the program
19	itself contains whatever announcements were obtained
20	by or credits for whatever underwriting was
21	obtained by WGBH.
22	Q And, in fact, this occurs with respect to

1	a national feed that is, that you have the
2	combination, if you will, of national underwriting and
3	local underwriting, with respect to some of the
4	programming, isn't that correct?
5	A There is actually very few programs that
6	are fully underwritten. That is to say, most programs
7	have some station money via PBS in them which enables
8	local underwriting messages, and so the answer is yes.
9	Q And I believe it's correct from that I
10	understand your testimony that the guidelines that
11	you were talking about yesterday were mandatory with
12	respect to the national underwriting that occurred as
13	part of the feed but was precatory or optional with
14	respect to the adjacencies that of underwriting
15	announcements that the local stations might put in
16	themselves?
17	A That is correct, recalling, of course,
18	that the stations are also regulated by the FCC.
19	Q Correct. I think we all understand that
20	there is the FCC out there as well.
21	And you also testified yesterday that the
22	member stations made payments to PBS at two levels or

1	at two different kinds of payments. One was the
2	member service assessment, and the other was the
3	National Program Service assessment or fee, is that
4	correct?
5	A There are some others that are, you know,
6	de minimus by comparison. Those are the two main
7	program assessments.
8	Q And
9	A Or assessments.
10	Q And the member service assessment is for
11	purposes of reimbursing or paying PBS for its
12	administrative functions in terms of providing the
13	satellite, and things like that?
14	A That is correct.
15	Q What's the basis on which the member
16	stations are charged for that member service
17	assessment?
18	A There are two different formulae, one for
19	the member service assessment and one for the program
20	assessment. The member service assessment is
21	allocated or the total PBS budget is allocated to
22	stations on the basis of each station's Community

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Service Grant factor. 1 Do you care to know more about this? 2 Yes, I do, actually. 3 0 Each station, in the course of a 4 5 year, raises some amount of non-federal financial 6 support, acronym NFFS. At the end of the year, CPB, 7 in the course of gathering all of its financial 8 information from stations, adds up the total NFFS 9 raised by all of the stations. And let's say it's a 10 hundred dollars, and let's say a particular station's NFFS was one dollar. So that station's NFFS would be 11 12 one percent of the total amount raised by all 13 stations. 14 Now CPB distributes the federal support in 15 two pieces -- what's called a base grant, which presently I believe is about \$275,000, and then all of 16 17 the rest of the funds are distributed in proportion to 18 NFFS. So our hypothetical station gets one percent of whatever that pool is. 19 20 Now, we use that same factor at PBS, that one percent factor, to allocate the costs of our staff 21 22 and administration and operations. So, in fact, WNET

1	in New York, their factor is about four and a half
2	percent, WGBH's is around two and a half. The median
3	factor is .07 sorry, seven-tenths of one percent.
4	So when you add up all those factors, it
5	adds to 100 percent, and that's how we allocate that
6	cost.
7	Q So is it fair to say that those member
8	service assessments relate in terms of the size of the
9	income or the revenues that have been raised by the
10	member stations themselves?
11	A Those factors are essentially a proxy for
12	ability to pay.
1.3	Q Ability to pay. Okay.
14	And as you indicated, those stations that
15	have greater resources, greater income, and the like,
16	such as WNET or WGBH, pay more in terms of the member
17	service assessment than the smaller
18	A That is correct.
19	Q stations. Okay.
20	Now, the other assessment, the National
21	Program Service assessment, that's for the payment for
22	actually getting access to the programming, is that

1 | correct?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

A That supplies the budget to the Chief Program Executive at PBS. There are no staff costs in that. It's pure program budget dollars.

Q And what's the basis for the assessment calculation for the member stations for the programming?

Α It's a more complicated formula which was complicated to achieve an objective of leveling the playing field SO the costs evenly were more distributed. But it involves the same factor I described a moment ago -- CSG factor. But added into it are each station's -- one piece of it is station's -- what's -- so-called adjusted budget.

So we -- if one station has -- if all of the stations' budgets are a hundred dollars, and one station's operating budget is a dollar, then that's a one percent factor. The adjustments take into account the number of transmitters the station has. There is -- we deduct \$150,000 for each transmitter from their budget. We also deduct amounts provided to the station by PBS for national programming, so that a

1	WGBH or a WNET isn't penalized for being a producer of
2	programs for PBS. So we weigh up all those budgets.
3	And then the third factor is population.
4	I believe 20 percent it's a 20 percent weighting,
5	so that at the end of the day stations in very large
6	markets, like New York or Los Angeles, are paying
7	somewhat more because of the large population they
8	serve. And, conversely, small stations like KEET in
9	Eureka, California, are not paying more because they
10	serve a very small population.
11	Q And the population relates to the audience
12	size that that particular station might be able to
13	attract in those
14	A It's
15	Q markets?
16	A It's the grade A population according to
17	the Census. So it's the number of persons, not TV
18	households, not viewers, but persons who live in the
19	grade A circle that the transmitter covers.
20	Q And you said grade A circle?
21	A Sorry. The when signals are radiated
22	by a television transmitter, there is a a technical
I	T. Control of the Con

1	measure of signal strength. And at a particular
2	wherever the however far out that signal reaches at
3	that strength is deemed to be the grade A coverage of
4	the of that particular station. It averages 30 to
5	40, 45 miles radius from the transmitter.
6	Q And so the range of the transmitter is
7	defining the area in which this population might
8	receive the signal that the member station is
9	broadcasting?
10	A Correct. It's roughly analogous to the
11	what's called either the DMA, designated market area,
12	which is a proprietary term used by Nielsen, or ADI,
13	area of dominant influence, which is a proprietary
14	term used by Arbitron. But it's essentially the area
15	the station reaches.
16	Q And those last terms that you referred to,
17	those are terms and points of reference that are used
18	in the commercial broadcasting field indeed, in
19	broadcasting in general, aren't they, to define the
20	reach of broadcasting stations
21	A Yes.
22	Q with respect to population?

1	A Yes.
2	Q Now, it is correct, is it not, Mr. Downey,
3	that the public television stations compete for the
4	viewers with commercial television, both cable and
5	network?
6	A It depends on the sense in which you mean
7	that. If public broadcasters don't get up every
8	morning and say to themselves, "How can I beat the NBC
9	affiliate here in town?" We present the best programs
10	we're capable of acquiring or producing, and we hope
11	and we promote them as aggressively as we can, and
12	we hope a lot of people watch.
13	Now, if that's competition, so be it.
14	There's only so many viewers, and the pie has to get
15	cut somehow. But we do not think of ourselves as
16	being in head-to-head competition with the commercial
17	networks.
18	Q Well, would you agree with the statement
19	that a public television station competes for viewers
20	with commercial television, DBS, cable TV, and on-line
21	services, as well as a wide range of other options?
22	A Obviously, we are you know, viewers

1	have many things they can do when it's time to watch
2	TV, and there are lots of stations they can watch. So
3	sure, we're competing in the sense of hoping that our
4	programs attract, you know, lots of viewers. But,
5	again, our success or failure is not measured in terms
6	of whether we have the same ratings as NBC or ABC or
7	that's really not the objective.
8	Q Well, your success is defined, though, by
9	the fact that you have been able and by "you" I
10	mean, public broadcasting and public television has
11	been able to maintain its viewer share over the last
12	few years as we saw yesterday in the annual report
13	that Mr. Duggan was trumpeting, isn't that correct?
14	That was a measure of success?
15	A We have managed to maintain our average
16	rating and share, yes.
17	Q And that was in the face of a declining
18	share of viewership by the commercial broadcasters?
19	A That is correct.
20	Q And that was something that public
21	television was quite proud of, correct?
22	A We're delighted to be here, yes.

1	Q And you weren't hiding the fact that you
2	were maintaining the prime time market share vis-a-vis
3	the commercial broadcasters, correct?
4	A No, not hiding it. No.
5	Q In fact, you were proud of it, weren't
6	you?
7	A Yes. Again, we're proud of the programs
8	that we produce or, you know, have produced, and we're
9	proud to present them, and we're delighted, you know,
10	when people watch them and respond to them with
11	voluntary contributions, for example. That's the
12	business we're in, but it's a different business from
13	saying, "I want the largest share of audience I can
14	possibly get, and I'm willing to put on whatever
15	program it takes to achieve that."
16	Q My question was whether I started this
17	series of questions, whether public television
18	stations compete with commercial television for
19	viewers. And I think your answer to that is yes, we
20	do compete for viewers, correct?
21	A We do compete for viewers.
22	Q And the way you compete for viewers is

1	through the programming that you offer, correct?
2	A Yes, and the promotion and advertising.
3	Q But the way you get viewers is to offer
4	programs that the viewers can watch, right?
5	A Yes.
6	Q And the diversity of the programming that
7	you offer is, I take it from your testimony yesterday,
8	the reason why you have been able and "you," again
9	public broadcasting has been able to maintain its
10	share because of the diversity, isn't that correct?
11	A We we pride ourselves on providing a
12	diverse schedule. And, for example, in the course of
13	a month, approximately 80 percent of all U.S. TV
14	households will tune to PBS. But the average rating
15	for any program is only two percent.
16	And so what that suggests, if you think
17	about it, is a tremendous amount of churn or a lot of
18	different people coming to different programs over the
19	course of time, rather than, you know, one or two
20	programs which attract the entire audience. And that
21	is a hallmark of the service we provide a highly
22	diverse service that appeals to different people

1	because it presents different subjects intended for
2	different audiences.
3	Q And how do you know that?
4	A Those are Nielsen data.
5	Q And that's something that, I take it, PBS
6	follows or someone or somebody at PBS follows that
7	kind of data?
8	A It's all there is. It's the only way to
9	know, you know, who it's a matter it's a way of
10	counting the house. We are proud of what we do, and
11	we use public funds to do it. And if we spent a lot
12	of money on a program and nobody tuned in, that would
13	be an important message that we'd want to know. And
14	so we do gather and collect we are subscribers to
15	Nielsen and get their information.
16	It's a system that is designed for another
17	purpose, but it's again, it's the best there is,
18	because it's all there is.
19	Q And this counting the house is a practice
20	that goes on constantly at PBS?
21	A I'm trying to yes. No, it doesn't. We
22	get there are two different kinds of or there

1	are many different kinds of Nielsen data. There are
2	so-called overnights, which which involve meters in
3	I think about 48 markets, and we get that data daily.
4	But national data we only get for, I believe, a week
5	a month times 10, or 10 weeks a year. So we don't get
6	all of the data there is, but we get enough to to
7	satisfy our you know, our needs.
8	Q Is there a special department or group
9	within PBS that whose function deals with keeping
10	up with the Nielsen rating results?
11	A Yes. We have a PBS research department.
12	Q And where is that located?
13	A At PBS headquarters.
14	Q And who is in charge of that?
15	A A gentleman by the name of John Fuller.
16	Q And are the fruits of that activity
17	provided to the member stations as well?
18	A No. Well, some top-line, you know,
19	summary data gets into speeches, as you have probably
20	seen in the materials you've collected. But the bulk
21	of the data are regarded as proprietary, and each
22	station or a station has to individually subscribe

1	to Nielsen in order to have access to that data on a
2	regular basis.
3	Q And the individual stations, in fact,
4	generally do subscribe to
5	A Most most do.
6	Q So they get data on a station basis
7	themselves, and PBS gets it itself through the
8	department that you described
9	A Yes.
10	Q the research department, correct?
11	A Correct.
12	Q Does this research department also
13	commission studies with respect to ratings and
14	viewership?
15	A Not very often. Maybe one or two a year.
16	Q Now, focusing on the last two years
17	1996 and 1997 would you agree with me, Mr. Downey,
18	that as reflected in the annual report that you were
19	questioned about yesterday, that PBS has embarked upon
20	a new and different strategy with respect to the
21	future in terms of maintaining its position as the
22	leading proponent of quality television in the country?

1	A I think it's a difference of degree rather
2	than kind. But we have worked harder than than in
3	the past to establish relationships with media
4	partners.
5	Q And as a result of the initiatives that
6	are described in the annual report that you were
7	questioned about yesterday, and statements by Mr.
8	Duggan, is it, in fact, correct that PBS has had an
9	extraordinary and unprecedented period of growth and
10	ratings success in the last two years?
11	A We've had I'm not sure I ought to use
12	the word "extraordinary," but we have certainly
13	financial growth in the last couple of years has
14	exceeded prior years. That is not the case with
15	audience growth.
16	Q Do you know an individual by the name of
17	Tom Epstein?
18	A Yes.
19	Q Who is Mr. Epstein?
20	A Mr. Epstein is in charge of communications
21	for PBS, public information.
22	Q I want to show you yet another article,

1	not from <u>Current</u> though, and ask you to take a look at
2	that. It's an article from <u>Electronic Media</u> dated
3	February 23, 1998.
4	MR. KLEINBERG: I wouldn't leave you out,
5	Mr. Schaeffer, of anyone.
6	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Mr. Kleinberg, do
7	you want this marked now?
8	MR. KLEINBERG: Yes, I would.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Okay. All right.
10	BMI Exhibit 1X.
11	(Whereupon, the above-referred
12	to document was marked as BMI
13	Exhibit No. 1X for
14	identification.)
15	MR. KLEINBERG: We previously marked, in
16	connection with the direct case, some exhibits. I
17	don't know whether we do a new numbering system now
18	that we're on cross, so
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Yes, BMI 1X.
20	MR. KLEINBERG: 1X, okay.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Yes. That tells us
22	it's cross exam.

1	MR. KLEINBERG: Yes. Okay.
2	BY MR. KLEINBERG:
3	Q Mr. Downey, I wanted to refer you to the
4	third column. You're free to, of course, take a look
5	at the rest of the document, which has to do with
6	apparently some dispute Congress and PBS have been
7	having over the question of bonuses that were paid in
8	the last couple of years to PBS executives.
9	But you would see in that third column in
10	the second paragraph the following quote. "But Tom
11	Epstein, a PBS spokesman, said more bonuses than usual
12	were handed out in the last two years because the
13	network had an 'extraordinary and unprecedented'
14	period of growth and ratings success." Do you see
15	that?
1.6	A Yes.
17	Q Would you agree with Mr. Epstein's
18	supposed quote here and this is from an article
19	that the public broadcasting network had had an
20	extraordinary and unprecedented period of growth and
21	ratings success in 1996 and 1997?
22	A Well, I can only repeat what I said a

1	moment ago. There has been substantial growth
2	financially. There hasn't been substantial growth in
3	ratings, although that that doesn't necessarily
4	imply growth in this in this particular context.
5	Ratings success could be holding our own in the face
6	of other erosion with respect to the networks.
7	Q Well, in fact, isn't that the success that
8	PBS has been telling the world with its annual report
9	and Congress, with respect to the letter that we saw
10	yesterday that is, look how well we have done at
11	public television? While commercial television have
12	lost market share, we have remained steady. Is that
13	
14	A That's what we've been saying. Sorry.
15	The implication of your question was was to put a
16	different interpretation on this.
17	Q And that ratings success was what Mr.
18	Epstein described as being extraordinary and
19	unprecedented in the last two years, correct?
20	A Well
21	MR. RICH: Objection. He can only the
22	witness can only answer to his knowledge what Mr.

1	Epstein had in mind.
2	MR. KLEINBERG: Absolutely.
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Okay. Do you know
4	personally?
5	THE WITNESS: I have no idea personally.
6	All I can again, what I can say is that we our
7	ratings have remained essentially flat for the last
8	five years. In some levels, that's a success, because
9	the three commercial networks ratings have been
LO	going down. But basic cable ratings have been going
11	up.
L2	Now, is that extraordinary and
L3	unprecedented success? Not in my mind, frankly. You
L4	know, I can't attach those adjectives to that reality.
L5	I don't know what Epstein meant. I'm delighted and
L6	proud that we've been able to hold hold flat, you
L7	know, given what's happening to others.
L8	BY MR. KLEINBERG:
L9	Q Well, in fact, you have increased ratings,
20	for example, in daytime programming in the last two
21	years, isn't that correct?
22	A That is correct.

1	Q And you recall that the annual report for
2	1997 said that there was double digit increases in the
3	daytime programming?
4	A I'm sorry. I was referring to prime time
5	or evening broadcasting.
6	Q And, in fact, the daytime double digit
7	increases were 18 percent for children make sure I
8	get this correct so page 13 of the annual report,
9	which is ASCAP Exhibit 14X in front of you I don't
10	know if the Panel has theirs from yesterday or not.
11	And in the paragraph under the heading, "A
12	Neighborhood Where Children Count," the last sentence
13	reads, "Against commercial television's better
14	financed and more highly promoted competition, PBS
15	daytime viewing grew a remarkable 18 percent among
16	children ages 2 to 5, and 29 percent among youngsters
17	6 to 11." Do you see that?
18	A Yes.
19	Q Do you agree or disagree with the
20	description that that was that growth was
21	"remarkable"?
22	A I agree.

1	Q Would you agree that that was
2	unprecedented in the time period of 1996/1997, in
3	terms of PBS' history?
4	A I don't I don't know if it's
5	unprecedented or not, but it certainly is substantial.
6	Q Now, you were questioned yesterday, or you
7	did testify yesterday and I have the benefit of the
8	transcript, actually at page 2153, you said, at
9	line 21, "There is an increase in the federal
LO	appropriation, but some of these, you know, sources
Ll	have been decreasing, in particular support from
L2	corporations." Do you recall that
L3	A Yes.
L4	Q testimony yesterday? Isn't it, in
L5	fact, the case that corporate support, meaning
L6	corporate underwriting, has shown an increase or is
L7	projected to increase five percent this year?
L8	MR. RICH: Objection. I think it's a
L9	compound question. Has shown or projected to show
20	is there
21	MR. KLEINBERG: Projected.
22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: The objection is
- 1	

1	sustained.
2	MR. KLEINBERG: I will amend the question
3	to a projection.
4	THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Could you repeat
5	the question?
6	BY MR. KLEINBERG:
7	Q I said isn't it, in fact, the case that
8	PBS has projected a five percent increase in corporate
9	underwriting this year that is, 1998?
LO	A I don't know. We may have. I'm not aware
L1	of that.
12	Q Take a look at Exhibit 8X in the stack in
13	front of you, which is 8X, which is an article from
L4	Current dated January 19, 1998. It's entitled "Press
L5	Tour Notes, Wishbone Finds Underwriters." What I'm
L6	referring to, Mr. Downey, is the third column, the
L7	last sentence before the phrase "Yes, Jane Tennyson
L8	may return."
L9	There appears the following statement in
20	reference to remarks supposedly made by Mr. Duggan.
21	"Launched by PBS and four producing stations in July,
22	the group that is, the PRS Sponsorship Group has

1	brought in a total of \$11.5 million in corporate
2	support in its first six months. Based on these
3	results, Duggan projected a five percent increase in
4	corporate underwriting this year." Do you see that?
5	A Yes.
6	Q Were you unaware of that projection by Mr.
7	Duggan?
8	A Yes. I am also it's the story is
9	ambiguous. I'm not clear whether his five percent
10	projection has to do with well, first, it does seem
11	limited to corporate underwriting for PBS national
12	programs, and that presently is around 75 million. So
13	five percent of that would be three and a half
14	million, or some some order like that.
15	But it may also be that his five percent
16	is in reference to the goal of the PBS Sponsorship
17	Group, which raised \$11-1/2 million. So five percent
18	of that would be \$600,000 or something. So at the end
19	of bottom line, I'm not sure what he is referring
20	to.
21	Q But your belief was that PBS corporate
22	underwriting was on the decline, is that correct?

1	A I believe that's correct. I could refer
2	to some notes, but I am I am confident in saying
3	there has been no material change in the level of
4	corporate underwriting for PBS national programming in
5	recent years.
6	Q Well, there is no change, or there is a
7	decrease?
8	A Well, I'd have to refer to some notes, if
9	I may.
10	Q Well, your testimony yesterday, which I
11	read to you, said, "Sources have been decreasing, in
12	particular support from corporations."
13	A I'm reflecting on one of the exhibits that
14	shows corporate support declining. I'm not able to
15	put my finger on it just yet. If you'd like, I will
16	try to find it.
17	Q Please.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: I'm going to run
19	and get my exhibits. I left them on my desk.
20	JUDGE DREYFUS: Just for clarification,
21	the sentence that you read says, "Sources are
22	decreasing." Does that mean the percentage of

1	underwriting is decreasing or the number of
2	underwriters is decreasing? Should we ask the witness
3	to clarify that sentence, or
4	MR. KLEINBERG: It's
5	JUDGE DREYFUS: is it clear from the
6	other testimony?
7	MR. KLEINBERG: It says, "Sources have
8	been decreasing, in particular support from
9	corporations." I understood that to mean the dollars
10	coming from corporate sources were decreasing. But
11	let's ask the witness whether that's what he meant or
12	not.
13	THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I was searching
14	for this exhibit now. What was your question?
15	BY MR. KLEINBERG:
16	Q My question is, when you testified
17	yesterday that sources have been decreasing, in
18	particular support from corporations, were you stating
19	that the amount of dollars received or to be received
20	from corporate underwriters was decreasing in absolute
21	dollars?
22	A Yes. I was referring to our Exhibit PB 4,

1	which is part of my testimony on page 13.
2	Q Yes.
3	A And if you see in the second this is a
4	bar a bar chart. And you see in the second block
5	labeled "Business" that the amount has been decreasing
6	over the period '92 to '96.
7	Q Which page?
8	A Page 13 of my testimony.
9	JUDGE DREYFUS: Oh, of your testimony.
10	BY MR. KLEINBERG:
11	Q Well, that chart talks about the
12	percentage of annual revenues rather than the actual
13	dollars, does it not, Mr. Downey?
14	A You're correct. But I having now
15	refreshed my memory, I can say that the amount of
16	corporate underwriting for PBS programs has been
17	declining over the past since fiscal '93. I'm
18	sorry, '95, since fiscal '95.
19	Q Are you talking about the share out of the
20	total, or the
21	A No. I'm talking about
22	Q amount of dollars?

	A Absolute dollars.
2	Q And what are you looking at to reach that
3	conclusion?
4	A Data that reports the total amount of
5	the total value of the PBS National Program Service.
6	Q Are you talking about donated broadcast
7	rights?
8	A No.
9	Q Well, what are
10	A What I'm talking excuse me. I'm
11	talking about corporate underwriting.
12	Q Okay. And what are you looking at, if
13	you're looking at anything, to when you're talking
14	about this?
15	A I don't know if this has been submitted or
16	not, but it's
17	MR. RICH: May I take
18	MR. KLEINBERG: Well, I don't know. We
19	don't have copies of this.
20	BY MR. KLEINBERG:
21	Q Let me just ask this question to you.
22	JUDGE GULIN: Let me just throw out one

1	thing.
2	MR. KLEINBERG: Yes.
3	JUDGE GULIN: In Exhibit Public
4	Broadcasting Exhibit 4 that you alluded to a moment
5	ago, Mr. Downey, would you take a look at the public
6	broadcasting revenue by source, FY96. Now, the
7	figures that are do you have that?
8	THE WITNESS: Does it look like this?
9	JUDGE GULIN: That's right. Table 2.
10	THE WITNESS: Yes.
11	JUDGE GULIN: Now, the public broadcasting
12	revenues under television system, that's for that
13	includes the local stations, correct? That's not just
14	public that's not just PBS.
15	THE WITNESS: That's correct. These are
16	station
17	JUDGE GULIN: Okay. And in the
18	conversation you're having right now, we're talking
19	about just PBS
20	THE WITNESS: Yes.
21	JUDGE GULIN: underwriting? Okay. So
22	these figures would be of no use to you, then. Can

1	you come to any conclusions based upon these
2	THE WITNESS: No.
3	JUDGE GULIN: Okay.
4	BY MR. KLEINBERG:
5	Q So to round this out, going back to where
6	we started, you don't know what or whether Mr. Duggan
7	projected a five percent increase in corporate
8	underwriting this year for PBS as reflected in ASCAP
9	Exhibit 8X, is that fair, Mr. Downey?
10	A I was not aware he made that projection,
11	no.
12	Q Now, I mentioned to you before the term
13	"donated broadcast rights," which I don't think is a
14	term that we've heard before. That reflects the value
15	of programming that has been underwritten by corporate
16	sponsors, does it not?
17	A Yes.
18	Q And that is an amount that's reflected in
19	the financial statements of PBS?
20	A That is correct.
21	Q And is it not, in fact, correct that the
22	donated broadcast rights have increased in value from

1	1996 to 1997, from \$139 million in 1996 to
2	\$142 million in 1997? And I refer you to the annual
3	report and page 21 thereof, which is the consolidated
4	statement of activity.
5	A I believe those are our certified
6	financials, and I will accept that as a truthful
7	statement.
8	Q And that reflects corporate underwriting,
9	does it not?
10	A I'm trying to recall. There's a technical
11	definition of donated broadcast rights that involves
12	the FASB, and I remember reading I'm sorry
13	meeting with the auditors over that very data, and
14	having long and inconclusive debates about what should
15	or shouldn't be included. What is there was
16	represents the best of our ability to try to comply
17	with the regulations, the FASB standards.
18	I'm hesitant to say yes, absolutely, it
19	it equals corporate underwriter. It may include
20	foundation and government, for example, sources that
21	also contribute donated program rights.
22	What I can say is that it represents the

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

	value of programs contributed to PBS where the Cash to
2	produce those programs did not flow through PBS'
3	books.
4	Q Do not flow through PBS' books?
5	A Do not flow through our books. So when
6	WGBH delivers Masterpiece Theatre, which Mobil
7	underwrites, we get a videotape and we broadcast it or
8	put it on the on the satellite to the stations, and
9	we make a you know, we carry the value of that
LO	donation in this number called contributed or donated
L1	program rights. But, again, I can't assure you that
L2	it equates solely to corporate contributions.
L3	Q Now, you state at page 21 of your written
L4	testimony that there has been a "significant decline"
L5	in cultural programming. Do you recall that
L6	testimony, sir?
L7	A Yes.
L8	Q And you would agree with me that according
L9	to your written testimony, as of 1994, there were
20	still there was still 16 percent of PBS' broadcast
21	hours relating to cultural programming, correct?
22	A Yes.

1	Q And you would agree with me also, would
2	you not, that that amount of cultural programming is
3	far more than cultural programming that appears on
4	commercial television?
5	A I couldn't say. I have no idea.
6	Q Well, how about if I focused in on
7	commercial broadcasting television. Would you agree
8	that commercial television broadcasting does not have
9	16 percent of its total broadcasting hours directed to
10	cultural programming?
11	A Assuming the same definition PBS uses, I
12	would agree with you.
13	Q And cultural programming, within the PBS
14	lexicon, includes things like Masterpiece Theatre,
15	Great Performances, Evening at the POPS, those types
16	of programs?
17	A I believe that would be found in that
18	cultural programming, yes.
19	Q And would you agree
20	A I'm sorry. Could you tell me where to
21	look?
22	Q Page 21 of your written testimony. And
	1

1	I'm
2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Mr. Kleinberg,
3	let
4	MR. KLEINBERG: Yes?
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: me just
6	interrupt one thing. I'm one step behind you. On the
7	donated broadcast rights, there's a footnote
8	note 7
9	MR. KLEINBERG: Yes. I was just going to
10	go back to that myself, Your Honor, having
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Well, go ahead,
12	then. I won't
13	BY MR. KLEINBERG:
14	Q Well, I wanted to direct your attention,
15	Mr. Downey, to footnote 7, which appears on page 25,
16	in which the subject matter of donated broadcast
17	rights is referred to. And it states as follows,
18	"Donated broadcast rights are administered by PBS for
19	distribution to television stations through its
20	national programming services. Donated broadcast
21	rights are valued at the total amount of underwritten

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

funds provided for a particular production." Does

1	that
2	MR. RICH: Could he give the witness a
3	chance, again, to
4	MR. KLEINBERG: Oh, I'm sorry.
5	MR. RICH: He's got a lot of documents
6	he's shuffling, and
7	MR. KLEINBERG: The annual report
8	THE WITNESS: I know what I'm looking for.
9	I just haven't found it yet.
10	MR. RICH: What page is it?
11	MR. KLEINBERG: Page 25.
12	THE WITNESS: Yeah. I still don't I
13	can't tell you because I either I don't know or
14	I've forgotten whether that's exclusively corporate or
15	whether foundation or federal association, other
16	underwriting grants, would be captured in this in
17	this category.
18	BY MR. KLEINBERG:
19	Q Is it a typical reference to "underwritten
20	funds" to refer to government sources?
21	A That would refer to all underwriting,
22	which comes from numerous sources, including corporate

1	but also including stations, producers, Federal
2	Government, associations, private individuals, and
3	others.
4	Q Okay. Going back, again, to the cultural
5	programming. Is it, in fact, the case, Mr. Downey,
6	that cultural programming continues to constitute a
7	large portion of pledge drive schedules?
8	A There is a I couldn't tell you a
9	percentage, but there is a fair amount of cultural
10	programming in pledge drive schedules.
11	Q Well, naturally, I'm able to find some
12	document that has some numbers on it, so why don't we
13	add some more to the record. Let's take a look at PBX
14	or PB Exhibit 3 in the binder. Now I can't find
15	it.
16	MR. KLEINBERG: Page 10. Thank you, Ms.
17	McGivern.
18	BY MR. KLEINBERG:
19	Q Under the category of "Pledge Programming"
20	first of all, let's identify this document which
21	was part of the exhibits I think referred to by Public
22	Broadcasting in their written testimony. These are
	i e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e

1	research notes prepared by the Corporation on Public
2	Broadcasting?
3	A Yes.
4	Q And deals with the subject matter of 20
5	years of public television programming highlights of
6	the 1994 CPB programming survey?
7	A Yes.
8	Q Directing your attention to page 10 of
9	this document, does that page refresh your
10	recollection as to the amount of pledge day schedules
11	that were of the cultural genre?
	!
12	A I don't see cultural per se. I see
12	A I don't see cultural per se. I see programs that might or categories that might fit
13	programs that might or categories that might fit
13	programs that might or categories that might fit into.
13 14 15	programs that might or categories that might fit into. Q Do you see the paragraph that reads, "Of
13 14 15	programs that might or categories that might fit into. Q Do you see the paragraph that reads, "Of course, the most significant difference from pledge
13 14 15 16 17	programs that might or categories that might fit into. Q Do you see the paragraph that reads, "Of course, the most significant difference from pledge and non-pledge period comparisons came from a single
13 14 15 16 17	programs that might or categories that might fit into. Q Do you see the paragraph that reads, "Of course, the most significant difference from pledge and non-pledge period comparisons came from a single program subgence music/dance performance"?
13 14 15 16 17 18	programs that might or categories that might fit into. Q Do you see the paragraph that reads, "Of course, the most significant difference from pledge and non-pledge period comparisons came from a single program subgence music/dance performance"? A Yes.

1	A Yes.
2	Q And
3	A I also see the first paragraph under
4	"Pledge Programming," which does note that this method
5	is somewhat imperfect.
6	Q Well, however perfect or imperfect it is,
7	it was at least sufficient for purposes of the
8	Corporation for Public Broadcasting to utilize their
9	limited resources to put out this report, wasn't it?
10	A Yes.
11	Q And there's a chart here that's or a
12	graph, I guess, Mr. Downey, which happens to have been
13	reproduced by my friends at White & Case this
14	happens to be sitting here which shows the relative
15	importance of music/dance in percentage of air time.
16	Do you see that?
17	A Yes.
18	Q And you don't have any reason to disagree
19	with that that the music and dance component is
20	on pledge days is as significant as it appears from
21	the graph?
22	A Only just noting, again, the caveat in

1	this report itself. With that caveat, this I would
2	accept this.
3	Q Now, you also have acknowledged or
4	indicated in your written testimony that children's
5	programming has shown a trend of revitalization after
6	a period of decline, correct?
7	A Yes.
8	Q And I think on page 23 of your testimony
9	you indicated 29 percent of public broadcasting's
LO	broadcast hours in 1994 were children's programming,
L1	correct? Page 23?
L2	A I see it. I'm just trying to reflect
L3	recall what it's 29 percent of. But I certainly said
L4	that in my testimony, yes.
L5	Q And you don't know what 29 percent refers
L6	to? If you'll look on page 21 of your testimony,
L7	there appears to be a chart there entitled "Percentage
L8	of Broadcast Hours Represented by Various Program
L9	Types."
20	A Yes.
21	Q While my math skills are not quite as
22	adept as others, it would appear that if you combine
3	1

the numbers for general children's and youth and
Sesame Street for 1994, you come up with 29 percent.
A That's my recollection. That's where that
number came from.
Q And that would be a percentage of all
broadcast hours, correct?
A Yes.
Q Have you had an opportunity to compare
that number with the number that Dr. Jaffe utilized in
his written testimony for purposes of describing the
broadcast hour components of public television?
A I'm sorry. I haven't read Mr. Jaffe's
testimony in several months, so you'll have to
Q Well, there's a chart at the end of his
in his testimony, and that's his testimony is the
first part of this written testimony package. It's
data underlying Figure 4, and it appears, since it's
not eight pages after his signature.
A PBS program hours by program type?
Q Right. 1992 to 1996.
A Okay.
Q And your written testimony referred to

1	1994, indicated children's programming represented 29
2	percent of broadcast hours for 1994. Dr. Jaffe says
3	30.7 percent for 1994. But my real focus was on 1996,
4	and the fact that, at least according to Dr. Jaffe,
5	children's programming had increased to 33.4 percent
6	of the total broadcast hours. Do you see that
7	A Yes.
8	Q Mr. Downey?
9	A Yes.
10	Q Does that conform to your understanding of
11	the relative percentage of broadcast hours that
12	children's programming occupied in 1996 on public
13	television?
14	MR. RICH: I object to the form of the
15	question.
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Do you want to
17	respond?
18	MR. KLEINBERG: I'm not sure I understand
19	what the basis of the objection is, so I don't
20	MR. RICH: I believe it's a misportrayal
21	of what the data underlying Figure 4 purport to
22	represent.

1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Well, why don't you
2	rephrase the question.
3	BY MR. KLEINBERG:
4	Q Well, let me ask you whether you have
5	would you have any reason to believe that children's
6	programming, in terms of program hours, was not 33.4
7	percent in 1996?
8	A I want to be there are some apples and
9	oranges here. The data we're looking at, the data
10	underlying Figure 4, refer to programs distributed by
11	PBS, as distinct from programs broadcast by public
12	television stations. So the number in my testimony is
13	based on the so-called Katzman Report, which is of
14	the broadcast hours of all TV stations of programming
15	from all sources, in contrast to these data.
16	Q So this is Dr. Jaffe is talking about
17	just the PBS national feed?
18	A Well, I'm not I'm not going to tell you
19	what I think what Dr. Jaffe is talking about, but
20	I can tell you these data have to do with programs
21	distributed by PBS.
22	O When you say "these data." which data are

1	you referring to?
2	A Data underlying Figure 4.
3	Q Okay. And the 29 percent figure that you
4	use referred to all public television, not just the
5	PBS feed?
6	A That's correct.
7	Q Okay. And would you agree with me, Mr.
8	Downey, that the children's programming that is
9	broadcast on public television contains significant
LO	amounts of copyrighted music?
L1	A That's my impression.
L2	Q And you have not done any music analysis
_3	yourself, in terms of
.4	A I have not.
.5	Q amount of music, or the like, is that
-6	correct?
.7	A That's correct.
-8	Q And to the extent that you refer to music
L9	use data in your written testimony, that's all
20	derivative of what Dr. Jaffe had in his written
21	testimony, is that also correct?
22	A That's correct.

1	Q Now, lastly, you indicated, I believe
2	strike lastly.
3	Penultimately, while we are on the subject
4	of music and PBS programming, would you agree that
5	music programming is an important component of PBS
6	programming in general?
7	A Yes, it's an important component.
8	Q And do you know an individual by the name
9	of Glenn DuBose?
10	A I do.
11	Q And is Mr. DuBose the Director of Drama,
12	Performance, and the Arts at PBS?
13	A I think that's the correct title, yes.
14	Q And I want to show you an article from
15	Broadcasting & Cable, dated September 1, 1997, which
16	I would ask to be marked as the next
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: BMI Exhibit 2X.
18	(Whereupon, the above-referred
19	to document was marked as BMI
20	Exhibit No. 2X for
21	identification.)
22	BY MR. KLEINBERG:

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

And there is an article entitled "Music is 1 0 in the Mix at PBS, " which begins, "Music programming 2 3 takes up little space on the commercial broadcast network's shelf, but that's not the case at PBS. 4 5 noncommercial network provides a lineup heavy with music series and specials." And then, it goes on to 6 7 quoting supposedly from Mr. say, DuBose, 8 commitment is there, and it's strong." Is that a correct statement of PBS' position with respect to 9 10 music utilized on the PBS network?

MR. RICH: May I ask for a clarification? There is a statement in the first paragraph which is not attributed to Mr. DuBose, and then there's a quote, and I'm not clear if Mr. Kleinberg is asking this witness to affirm the quote or the preceding paragraph as well.

BY MR. KLEINBERG:

Q Let's take them separately, which is the first paragraph which says, "Music programming takes up little space on the commercial broadcast network's shelf, but that's not the case at PBS. "The noncommercial network provides a lineup heavy with

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

music series and specials." And do you agree with 1 2 that, Mr. Downey? Well, I -- you know, I agree with the data 3 4 that we've been looking at this morning. I hesitate to characterize it beyond that. 5 It is what it is. And so you're not prepared to put a 6 7 qualitative or quantitative judgment on that data? Ά Well, it's -- you know, it's more than --8 9 I'm willing to accept that it's more than appears on 10 commercial broadcasts, although I sure haven't conducted any study of that. There is a goodly amount 1.1 12 of music and performance programming and particularly associated with pledge and during other times of the 13 14 There has been for years. It has changed 15 somewhat over the years, but basically we are -- we 16 have a commitment to that, just as we have commitment to public affairs, as we have a commitment 17 18 to children's programming. 19 Mr. DuBose is expressing, you know, his 20 point of view because that's his area. And I accept and agree with that, but I don't want to leave any 21 22 impression that suddenly PBS has a greater commitment

1	to music programming than any other kind.
2	Q But would you accept the characterization
3	that there is a commitment, a strong commitment, to
4	music as part of the PBS programming?
5	A Yes.
6	Q And would you agree that music is
7	important to PBS because it enables PBS to reach a
8	vast audience?
9	A Well, I mean, I'm mindful of what I said
10	earlier about vast audiences. I think I would be more
11	comfortable with diverse audiences than vast. We're
12	just not in the vast audience business. I think
13	well, I'll leave it at that.
14	Q So you would accept diverse, but not vast,
15	as why music is important to PBS, in terms of the
16	ability to reach the audience?
17	A PBS believes in presenting diverse in
18	programs, quality programs, to its audience. That
19	includes music, and we try to meet that same standard
20	in that genre. And, you know, we hope it will be
21	appreciated and watched.
22	Q But as you said before, you don't

particularly care how many people watch it? Well, I care that it's watched, but the 2 Ά 3 objective is not simply a large viewership. If it were, there would be a different kind of programming 4 5 That should be self-evident. on PBS. 6 Well, is an objective that you get as many 7 people to watch it, not whether it's simply to get 8 many -- as many people as possible? 9 Our predictions and -- lie in the programs 10 themselves, meaning, you know, our tests of editorial 11 integrity, of quality, of diversity, we are, again, 12 proud of those programs. We -- they are consistent with our mission, and we -- we hope that they will be 13 14 widely viewed and appreciated. But if the objective 15 were simply a 15 rating or a 20 rating, it would be a 16 different kind of programming. Music certainly 17 contributes to that. 1.8 Other things being equal, does PBS prefer 0 19 to have a larger or smaller audience for its programs? 20 Other things being equal, a larger --I mean, you know, tonight you can watch Bill 21 22 Moyers on Addiction, a three-night special -- Sunday,

1

1	Monday, and Tuesday night. I will wager you you
2	wouldn't find that on commercial broadcasting. It's
3	not going to attract a large audience. Are we
4	committed to it? Yes, by definition; it's on the air.
5	Q Lastly, you indicated, I think, on your
6	direct testimony that BMI and ASCAP music licensing
7	fees for the next five-year period for public
8	television shouldn't go up. And my question to you,
9	sir, is, can you tell the Panel what the public
10	television music licensing fee is today for BMI and
11	ASCAP?
12	A I believe it's I'm not I'm not sure
13	I'm precise about this. I believe it's around
14	\$4-1/2 million a year.
15	Q And is that for public television?
16	A That's for both, public radio and
17	television.
18	Q My question was specifically focusing on
19	public television. What is the fee that exists with
20	respect to public television?
21	A I'm not I'm not sure I know.
22	Q Do you know, relative to public radio,

	what the breakout is between the fee
2	A I recollect
3	Q that the public broadcasters are
4	seeking in this case?
5	A My collection is that the television piece
6	is 3.7, 3.6, and radio is the remainder, bringing it
7	to about 4.5. But
8	Q And is that reflected in your testimony
9	anywhere, sir?
1.0	A I don't believe so.
11	Q And where would that breakout come from?
12	A My recollection of conversations and 20
13	years of experience in public broadcasting.
14	Q And can you explain to the Panel what the
15	allocation is between public television and public
16	radio in terms of the fee
17	A No.
18	Q and how it was arrived at?
19	A No.
20	Q I'm sorry. I you're saying 3.6 out of
21	4.5 refers to public television?
22	A I believe that's correct.

1	Q But you don't know how that was arrived at
2	in terms of breaking the fee into the two components
3	for TV and radio, right?
4	A Well, I believe it was arrived at through
5	arms length negotiations. But
6	Q Oh, I see. You believe that there was a
7	negotiation with the performing rights organizations
8	separately with respect to the television and radio
9	fee?
10	MR. RICH: I'm going to object to this
11	line. The predicate questions from the examiner
12	presupposed that there was such a separate negotiated
13	fee, which we all know, in fact, is not true. And I
14	think it's terribly misleading to the witness to
15	pursue this line of questioning.
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Do you want to
17	respond?
18	MR. KLEINBERG: Actually, I wasn't
19	presupposing anything. I was asking whether, in fact,
20	there has been any allocation done by public
21	television and/or public radio of what had been a
22	unitary fee. That was the import of my question.

1	MR. RICH: I believe well, I have no
2	problem with that question. I don't believe that was
3	the purport of the earlier questions, however.
4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Can you answer that
5	question, sir?
6	THE WITNESS: Could you repeat the
7	question?
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Sure.
9	BY MR. KLEINBERG:
10	Q You indicated that there was a total fee
11	paid for radio and television of \$4.5 million. And my
12	question to you is whether there has been an
13	allocation of that total fee as between how much
14	represents the fee for public television and how much
15	for public radio.
16	A Well, it's all paid by or has been paid
17	by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. You asked
18	me if I knew what the allocation was or, you know, how
19	much was for TV and how much is radio. And I'm,
20	frankly, guessing. That's my recollection, but I
21	can't tell you why I know that or where it came from.
22	Q But you do believe you have an

1	understanding that there has been a breakout of the
2	total fee into the two constituent parts of television
3	and radio?
4	A Again, you asked me for if I knew, and
5	I'm telling you what I what I recall or what comes
6	to mind. And I thought that it was compartmentalized.
7	I could be wrong. I don't know.
8	JUDGE GULIN: Whatever the fee, whatever
9	the allocation happens to be and you're obviously
10	not exactly sure what it is is it your impression
11	that that allocation was negotiated between
12	THE WITNESS: I have no idea. I probably
13	should have pleaded ignorance about four questions
14	ago.
15	JUDGE DREYFUS: One moment, please.
16	MR. KLEINBERG: Sure.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Go ahead.
18	JUDGE DREYFUS: Are you staying with this
19	area, or are you going on to something else?
20	MR. KLEINBERG: This was the last I was
21	going to ask one or two followup questions on this.
22	JUDGE DREYFUS: Okay. My problem is that

1	there hasn't been a foundation laid with this witness
2	that he would even be qualified to answer these
3	questions.
4	MR. KLEINBERG: Well, my question was
5	whether he knew about it.
6	BY MR. KLEINBERG:
7	Q And this is going to be my followup
8	question. You indicated that the Corporation for
9	Public Broadcasting pays the music license fees,
LO	correct?
L1	A Correct.
L2	Q And the corollary of that also is public
L3	PBS hasn't paid any portion of that fee, is that
L4	correct?
L5	A That's technically correct. But we think
L6	of the money the corporation has as being funds
L7	available for public television of which we are part.
L8	So with that caveat
L9	Q And
20	A If CPB didn't have to pay that amount,
21	then that's money that would be distributed to public
22	television and radio stations and could end up in

1	programming or for some other purpose.
2	Q And have you participated in any
3	discussions or analysis with persons at the
4	Corporation for Public Broadcasting as to what the
5	appropriate levels of fees should be with respect to
6	the performing rights music licensing organizations?
7	A I don't
8	MR. RICH: May I caution the witness, with
9	the Panel's consent, not to reveal any privileged
10	conversations he might have had in this regard.
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Attorney-client
12	privilege.
13	MR. RICH: Yes.
L4	THE WITNESS: And I was going to say that
15	I've had conversations about this with counsel, but I
16	don't honestly I don't think I've had any direct
L7	conversations with any CPB employees, at least in the
18	last several months, about this subject.
19	BY MR. KLEINBERG:
20	Q Well, you indicated that if CPB didn't pay
21	the fee, then that money would be available for
22	distribution to public television/public radio, right?

A Yes.
Q And my question was, do you have in mind,
or do you have an understanding of how much of the
money would be available or has, in effect, been taken
away from public television as a result of the fee
being paid by Corporation for Public Broadcasting?
A Are you asking me what the fee is?
Q I'm asking you you told me what you
thought the fee was, which was 4.5 million. I think
actually the fee was 3.925 million. But assuming that
that's the fee, my question is whether you have any
understanding of what portion that amount of the fee
represents for purposes of public television?
A CPB has a statutory obligation to pay the
fee, so it's you know, it's a hypothetical question
that I haven't dwelled upon, and
JUDGE DREYFUS: Does that mean CPB cuts
the check?
THE WITNESS: To the best of my knowledge,
yes.
JUDGE DREYFUS: They cut the check
directly to ASCAP and BMI?

1	THE WITNESS: That's my understanding,
2	yes.
3	JUDGE DREYFUS: Okay.
4	THE WITNESS: That the
5	BY MR. KLEINBERG:
6	Q And following up, if I might, there is no
7	chargeback to the public television stations or radio
8	stations or PBS for any amount of that fee, correct?
9	A To the best of my knowledge, there is no
10	allocation or division or penalty or, you know, even
11	as far as I'm not even sure as to the there's
12	been any publication. I believe that the the data
13	has been embargoed has you know, has been held
14	confidential in past years.
15	Q I'm sorry. What data?
16	A Whatever the fee was
17	Q Oh.
18	A was treated as confidential
19	information. I'm not sure why, but that's my
20	understanding.
21	Q Finally, Mr. Downey, I
22	(Laughter.)

1	someone has asked me to ask this
2	question. It was not I would have been done.
3	When you were good enough to provide us
4	with some information on the formula for the
5	programming assessment, and you indicated 20 percent
6	was attributed to the size of the population, and then
7	you said there was another percentage for the non-
8	federal revenue and another percentage for the
9	station's adjusted budget, do you can you supply us
10	with what those percentages are for the other two
11	components?
12	A I was afraid you would ask that. I I
13	believe it's 45 percent adjusted budget, 35 percent
L4	Community Service Grant factor, and 20 percent
L5	population, and I hope that adds to 100.
L6	MR. KLEINBERG: I'm reminded that I should
L7	also move into evidence whatever it is that I offered,
18	which would be
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: BMI 1 Exhibits
20	1 and 2.
21	MR. KLEINBERG: Right.
22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Any objection?

1	MR. RICH: No objection to 1X.
2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. 1X is
3	received.
4	(Whereupon, the above-referred
5	to document, previously marked
6	as BMI Exhibit No. 1X for
7	identification, was received in
8	evidence.)
9	MR. RICH: 2X is an opinion piece, which
10	as to which I would certainly not object for the
11	to its admission for the limited purpose of the
12	witness' reactions to Mr. DuBose's comments. But as
13	to the rest, this is an opinion piece by some
14	columnist.
15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right.
16	JUDGE DREYFUS: Does that mean no
17	objection?
18	JUDGE GULIN: No, I don't think
19	MR. RICH: It means I do object if it
20	comes in for all purposes.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Mr. Kleinberg, do
22	you have any response?

1	MR. KLEINBERG: Well, let me ask a
2	followup question, if I could, please, to the witness.
3	BY MR. KLEINBERG:
4	Q Mr. Downey, are you familiar with the
5	publication <u>Broadcasting & Cable</u> ?
6	A I am.
7	Q And would you agree that that is a
8	standard industry publication?
9	A It is.
10	Q And with respect to the balance of the
11	article, which I didn't go into, there is a series of
12	information about musical programs that are appearing
13	or are scheduled to appear on public television. Do
14	you see that?
15	A I do.
16	Q Do you have any reason to doubt the
17	accuracy of those programs and their the fact that
18	they are part of, or have been part of, public
19	television?
20	MR. RICH: Object to the form.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Do you want to
22	respond before we sustain the objection, Mr.
	1

1	Kleinberg?
2	(Laughter.)
3	MR. KLEINBERG: Well, I'll rephrase the
4	question.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Thank you.
6	BY MR. KLEINBERG:
7	Q Do you have any understanding, based upon
8	your responsibilities at PBS, as to whether the
9	programs listed in this article out of <u>Broadcasting &</u>
10	<u>Cable</u> , dated September 1, 1997, are, in fact, programs
11	that are part of the public broadcasting feed?
12	A They appear to me to be to be that,
13	yes.
14	Q Okay.
15	MR. RICH: I'll withdraw my objection
16	based on the witness' answer.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. 2X
18	BMI Exhibit 2X is accepted into evidence.
19	Thank you.
20	(Whereupon, the above-referred
21	to document, previously marked
22	as BMI Exhibit No. 2X for

1	identification, was received in
2	evidence.)
3	MR. KLEINBERG: I am done.
4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. Thank
5	you, sir.
6	MR. RICH: Your Honors, I will have some
7	redirect. And if we might take a slightly early mid-
8	morning break, and if we could expand it by five or 10
9	minutes, I would be appreciative. Can we get a total
10	of 20 minutes?
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. We'll
12	take a recess for 20 minutes.
13	(Whereupon, the proceedings in the
14	foregoing matter went off the record at
15	11:18 a.m. and went back on the record at
16	11:42 a.m.)
17	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
18	BY MR. RICH:
19	Q Mr. Downey, I briefly want to touch on a
20	few areas which Mr. Schaeffer and/or Mr. Kleinberg
21	touched on with you for purposes of clarification.
22	I'd ask you first to turn to the

1	compendium of data appearing at PB 4, which is the CPB
2	fiscal year annual reports.
3	Do you have that in front of you?
4	A I do.
5	Q And if you would turn to the first
6	document in that compendium which is fiscal year 1992
7	data, and turn to what is marked Table 2, please.
8	A Yes.
9	Q Am I correct, down at the entry for
10	business for public television, that business
11	contributions to public pardon me, to public
12	television income for FY1991 represented just over 17%
13	of total income for public television system-wide?
14	A That is correct.
15	Q I'm reading that correctly?
16	And then flipping over to the next to last
17	page in that compendium which is the FY1996 data, if
18	you would go to the comparable line under business and
19	go over to the column listed television system, am I
20	correct that the percentage reflected by business
21	dropped to 15% of total television system income?
22	A That's correct.

1	Q Now what happened to the absolute dollars
2	for business contribution between FY91 and FY96 if you
3	compare these two documents?
4	A Total business contributions actually
5	declined.
6	Q Can you read the appropriate numbers into
7	the record, please?
8	A Total business contributions to public
9	television in fiscal 1991, \$229,967,000. And for
10	fiscal 1996, \$223,251,495. So a reduction of
11	approximately \$6 million dollars.
12	Q And that's between FY91 and FY96, correct?
13	A Correct.
14	Q And as we've established, the percentage
15	which such contributions reflected, a total system
16	income decreased from 17 to 15%, correct?
17	A Correct.
18	Q Now
19	JUDGE GULIN: Let me just ask. The term
20	"business," is that synonymous with corporate
21	underwriting grants?
22	THE WITNESS: It includes

1	JUDGE GULIN: Does it encompass something
2	else?
3	THE WITNESS: It includes corporate
4	underwriting grants, but it's not exclusively
5	underwriting.
6	JUDGE GULIN: What else does it include?
7	THE WITNESS: Charitable contributions by
8	businesses to stations. You know, a \$500 annual
9	contribution or a contribution to an endowment or
10	capital fund raising campaign.
11	BY MR. RICH:
12	Q Now let's take a look, if you will do
13	you still have handy what was marked as ASCAP 14X,
14	which is the 1997 PBS report, which is this document?
15	A Yes.
16	Q Would you look at page two of this
17	document, please?
18	Now do you recall Mr. Kleinberg asked you
19	some questions relating to what I believe he termed
20	donated broadcast time, is that right?
21	A Donated broadcast rights.
22	Q Rights. And we talked about footnote

	seven and etc. associated with those?
2	A Yes.
3	Q Now on page two, in the upper right hand,
4	you'll see a category called program underwriting. Do
5	you see that?
6	A I do.
7	Q And what is your general understanding of
8	what that category comprises?
9	A I believe that's donated program rights.
10	Q So we're talking about the same thing?
11	A One and the same.
12	Q And I believe Mr. Kleinberg pointed out to
13	you that, between FY96 and FY97, there was an increase
14	in this category of from approximately \$139 million
15	dollars to approximately \$142 million dollars, is that
16	correct?
17	A Yes.
18	Q What happened to this category between
19	FY95 and FY97?
20	A Well, '95, according to our certified
21	financials, it was \$162.3 million dollars. And it
22	so from '95 to '97, it declined to \$142.6 or

1	approximately \$20 million.
2	Q So I take it that's consistent with your
3	prior testimony on cross examination by Mr. Kleinberg
4	that, to the best of your recollection, there was a
5	decline in corporate underwriting between the '95 and
6	'97 period, correct?
7	A Well, as we established, these donated
8	program rights include amounts from other than
9	corporations; but yes, in answer to your second part
10	of your question, yes, corporation underwriting also
11	declined over the same period.
12	Q Well, let me ask you, the two sets of data
13	we just looked at, the system-wide data respecting
14	business contributions and the PBS data respecting
15	what's termed program underwriting, do those data, at
16	least for the periods we've just reviewed, reveal a
17	pattern of increasing corporate dominance of public
18	television?
19	A Certainly not.
20	Q Now Mr. Schaeffer also showed you a nice
21	color chart from an exhibit in evidence as ASCAP 301,
22	and I'd like to take a look at that with you if we

1	could, please. This was the CPB 1996 annual report.
2	This was both this and a color chart of page 17 from
3	that document.
4	A Okay.
5	Q This is ASCAP 301 which is the 1996 CPB
6	annual report. And I'll let you look at the color
7	chart here, sir.
8	And I'm going to direct your attention to
9	page 17 of that document and let the Panel catch up
10	here with the documents. Take your time.
11	JUDGE GULIN: Is that the one there was
12	some confusion on the number? I have it 302.
13	MR. RICH: There was confusion on the
14	number. Looks like this.
15	Judge Gulin, do you have yours?
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: 301 or 302 now?
17	MR. RICH: Is it 302.
18	MR. SCHAEFFER: It's this document.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Yeah, I know.
20	MR. RICH: Maybe I mismarked it. I had
21	marked it as 301. Whatever it is, I think we know
22	which document we're referring to.

1	MR. SCHAEFFER: 302.
2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: It's 302.
3	MR. RICH: Thank you. My apologies.
4	BY MR. RICH:
5	Q Now Mr. Schaeffer showed you this document
6	and, as you and he discussed, it breaks down public
7	broadcasting income between private and governmental
8	sources, does it not?
9	A It does.
10	Q Now if one wanted to determine, sir, what
11	percentage of total broadcasting income in a given
12	year came from private sources, am I correct that you
13	would take the number at the top of the black circles,
14	which is the private revenue number, yes, and divide
15	that by the top line number labeled total to arrive at
16	the percentage which private income sources
17	represented of total public broadcasting income
18	sources?
19	A Yes.
20	Q And so, for example, for 1985, to
21	illustrate, we would divide \$559 million dollars
22	reflecting income from private sources by \$1.096

1	billion dollars?
2	A Yes.
3	Q And, by my math, that yields a percentage
4	of \$51% of private source contributions. Sound about
5	right?
6	A Sounds right.
7	Q Now for each of the later years, I'll
8	represent to you that my math, subject to other people
9	checking, revealed the following ratios: for 1987,
10	51%; for 1989, 53%; for 1991, 53%; for 1993, 53%
11	pardon me, did I say for 1991 it's 51%; for 1993,
12	53%; and 1995, 53%.
13	Now taking, for purposes of my question,
14	my math to be accurate, is that pattern roughly
15	consistent with your own experience and understanding,
16	namely that there has been relatively little change at
17	least back to 1985 in the private/public mix of
18	funding sources?
19	A That's consistent with my sense of this,
20	yes.
21	Q And I take it we agree that the private
22	sources, that is the numbers comprehended in these

1	black circles adding up to the total, encompass far
2	more than corporate underwriting support, isn't that
3	true?
4	A Oh, yes, yes.
5	Q It's membership dollars and other private
6	sources, correct?
7	A Yes.
8	Q Now in this connection, Mr. Schaeffer
9	asked you a question I'm sorry, I don't have the
10	transcript yet from yesterday, but my notes reveal
11	that his question to you asked you to confirm that a
12	combination of corporation and pledge drive sources
13	form the predominant source of public television
14	funding.
15	Your answer, I believe, was to agree that
16	membership income and corporate support formed the
17	majority share; but so the record is clear, did you
18	intend to indicate membership plus corporate or pledge
19	support plus corporate?
20	What's your answer?
21	A Pledge support is only a fraction of the
22	larger category called membership which incorporates
	1 1

1	other you know, all of the funds raised from all of
2	the techniques used by stations. And that's what I
3	understood the context of his question to be, which is
4	why I said membership plus business does constitute
5	the largest source.
6	Q Thank you.
7	Now you were asked some questions by Mr.
8	Schaeffer relating to the PBS Sponsorship Group. Do
9	you remember you had a conversation with him about
10	that?
11	A Yes.
12	Q And specifically, you were shown a press
13	release which I'd like you to put in front of you
14	which was marked but not offered in evidence as ASCAP
15	pardon me.
16	I beg your pardon. This is in evidence.
17	It's ASCAP 3X, a one page document that looks like
18	this.
19	A I have it.
20	Q And you'll recall that this document touts
21	the amount of corporate support garnered during the
22	first six months of the group's of the Sponsorship
	1

1	Group's existence, yes?
2	A Yes.
3	Q Now my question is this. Absent the
4	formation of the Sponsorship Group, would PBS and the
5	four large stations involved in the Sponsorship Group
6	nonetheless have continued to solicit corporate
7	support on their own?
8	MR. SCHAEFFER: Objection. That's clearly
9	leading.
10	MR. RICH: Well, let me ask it in a non-
11	leading fashion, if I may, although I think I'm
12	allowed some latitude on redirect.
13	What, in your estimation what
14	activities in the underwriting vein do you believe
15	that the four stations and PBS who comprise the PBS
16	Sponsorship Group would have undertaken in the absence
17	of this Sponsorship Group?
18	MR. SCHAEFFER: Objection. Hypothetical
19	and now he's saying what other people and other
20	stations would have done. If I had asked that
21	question, he would have shot me.
22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Oh, we haven't shot

1	anybody yet, but
2	(Laughter.)
3	MR. SCHAEFFER: I said he would have. I
4	didn't ask it.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Do you have any
6	comments?
7	Are you asking for his opinion as to
8	MR. RICH: Of course, based on of
9	course, based on his knowledge of underwriting
LO	practices about which Mr. Schaeffer
L1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right, the
L2	objection's overruled.
L3	Go ahead.
L 4	THE WITNESS: The Sponsorship Group
L5	consists of the four stations and PBS that we
16	identified yesterday, all of whom or each of which
L7	each of those four stations has a long history of
L8	attempting to raise corporate underwriting for its
L9	programs.
20	The Sponsorship Group represents a
21	coalition in the interest of more effective or more
22	efficient underwriting. But had that Sponsorship

1	Group not come about, those four stations would have
2	continued operating independently to seek to
3	achieve the same end, which is to raise as much
4	corporate underwriting for their programs as they can.
5	And so I think it's reasonable to assume
6	some or all of this \$7.5 million might have been
7	raised in that circumstance.
8	MR. RICH: So to conclude that this is all
9	incremental or found money that would not otherwise
10	have been available to the stations or to PBS is
11	speculative, correct?
12	MR. SCHAEFFER: Objection; leading.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: It's leading.
14	The objection is sustained.
15	MR. RICH: Let me move on, Mr. Downey.
16	Mr. Schaeffer showed you another document.
17	This one he did not, however, offer. This is ASCAP 7X
18	which I'd ask you to put in front of you. It's a
19	piece from The Cincinnati Inquirer dated October 10,
20	1996.
21	MR. SCHAEFFER: Can you wait just a
22	second, Mr. Rich?

1	MR. RICH: Sure.
2	MR. SCHAEFFER: Thank you.
3	BY MR. RICH:
4	Q If I can direct your attention to the
5	second page of this document, Mr. Downey. It's the
6	one to your right.
7	A Yes.
8	Q This was a piece relating to the Wishbone
9	series, I believe.
10	A Yes.
11	Q Do you see on the second page there's a
12	quote from a Rick Duffield?
13	A Yes.
14	Q And who is Mr. Duffield, do you know?
15	A Duffield is the producer of the Wishbone
16	series.
17	Q And the quote attributed to Mr. Duffield
18	is, "'It's extremely difficult to find underwriters
19	for children's programming on public television,'
20	Duffield said in June. 'Companies are hesitant to
21	commit marketing or advertising money for simply a ten
22	second underwriting credit. A TV commercial has more

(202) 234-4433

1	value to them."
2	In your experience, is that an accurate
3	statement?
4	A It's been very difficult over the years to
5	find underwriting for children's programs, yes.
6	Q We would like to offer this document at
7	this point.
8	MR. SCHAEFFER: No objection.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right, it will
10	be received.
11	Mr. Kleinberg, do you have any
12	MR. KLEINBERG: No.
13	JUDGE GULIN: Let me ask, Mr. Rich, you
14	don't have extra copies, do you?
15	MR. RICH: I do not.
16	MR. SCHAEFFER: We have them and we will
17	give them to you. Do you want it now or
18	JUDGE GULIN: That would be helpful
19	because it's now going to become PB Hearing Exhibit
20	Number 1.
21	MR. SCHAEFFER: Yeah, it's 7X.
22	JUDGE GULIN: It's right now marked as an

1	ASCAP exhibit.
2	MR. SCHAEFFER: It is; it's 7X for
3	identification and we all agree it should go in
4	evidence. But you were given copies yesterday.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: We have them, but
6	
7	JUDGE GULIN: I understand.
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: we need to mark
9	them now as Public Broadcasting Exhibit
10	MR. SCHAEFFER: Do you want to use mine?
11	JUDGE GULIN: Hearing Exhibit 1.
12	MR. RICH: Thank you.
13	MR. SCHAEFFER: Do you want another copy?
14	JUDGE GULIN: It would be helpful to have
15	that, yes.
16	MR. RICH: Thank you.
17	(Whereupon, the above-mentioned
18	document was marked as PB
19	Exhibit 1 for identification.)
20	(Whereupon, the above-mentioned
21	document, previously marked as
22	PB Exhibit 1 for

1.	identification, was received in
2	evidence.)
3	BY MR. RICH:
4	Q Mr. Downey, Mr. Schaeffer also showed you
5	some public television station Web pages purporting to
6	publicize those stations' advertising practices. Do
7	you recall those documents?
8	A Yes.
9	Q Am I correct or let me ask you this.
10	Prior to the advent of the Internet and the Web pages,
11	to your knowledge, did stations were stations able
12	to communicate their underwriting practices in some
13	other fashion?
L4	A Yes.
15	Q What were some
L6	A They would produce press kits or, you
L7	know, kits to be used by their representatives to
18	distribute it amongst businesses in the community.
L9	Q Is there anything as you had occasion
20	to review the documents you were shown yesterday, the
21	Web page excerpts, was there anything different or
22	unusual in the nature of the message that was being

1	communicated by these documents as opposed to the
2	former techniques you just averted to?
3	A Essentially the same content. You know,
4	what the benefits are, who some of the, you know,
5	traditional or longstanding local underwriters may be.
6	Again, essentially the same information.
7	Q Thank you.
8	Now you were asked yesterday also certain
9	questions about the PBS National Funding Standards and
LO	Practices Manual from February of 1997 which is in
L1	evidence as ASCAP 4X. Do you recall that?
L2	A Yes.
L3	Q Now Mr. Schaeffer focused you on the
L4	things that these guidelines seem to allow. I'd like
L5	to ask you a few questions about what these guidelines
L6	do by way of limitation, okay?
L7	And first and foremost, I'd ask you to
L8	turn to page seven of this document which is labeled
L9	Roman II, general principles for determining the
20	acceptability of national program funding.
21	Do you have that?
22	A Yes.

1	Q Could you describe for the Panel what
2	these general principles entail?
3	A There are two aspects to administering
4	these guidelines. One is determining whether there is
5	any relationship between the underwriter and the
6	content of the program that would cause us to question
7	the acceptability.
8	So it's a sort of relationship test. And
9	the second part is reviewing the actual announcement
10	that is proposed to appear on the program itself. Now
11	with respect to that first part, we administer
12	essentially three tests.
13	The first is called the editorial control
14	test. And our interest here is in preserving and
15	protecting the editorial integrity of PBS and public
16	television by ensuring that the underwriter had no
17	involvement in the editorial content or no ability to
18	affect the editorial content whether or not the
19	ability may have been exercised.
20	And if we were to discover such a thing,
21	we would reject the program.
22	The second test is the editorial

perception test which is a little more difficult. And what that addresses is circumstances where even though there may be no connection between the underwriter and the content of the program, by virtue of the nature of the underwriter and its business and the content of the program, a reasonable viewer might conclude otherwise.

So, for example, if there were to be a documentary about the history of Saudi Arabia and Mobil Oil Corporation were the underwriter, a reasonable person might conclude that Mobil Oil had something to do with the content of the program, which would be inappropriate given our objective again for editorial integrity.

And so we would reject that relationship on those grounds, the editorial perception test. The third test is a commercialism test which, in some ways, is similar to the editorial perception test.

And it asks is the reason the underwriter is involved in this program and is the reason the underwriter has contributed, so far as we can tell, purely a charitable act or does the underwriter have

1	some commercial interest at stake here.
2	If, for example, the program is about the
3	history of the automobile and the underwriter were the
4	Ford Motor Company, one could conclude that Ford's
5	interest is in selling cars and that would be an
6	impermissible relationship.
7	So we would decline to accept underwriting
8	from Ford for that program on the grounds of
9	commercialism as well as perception. And those
10	again, those two tests are somewhat similar but they
11	go to somewhat different dimensions.
12	The rest of these guidelines then have to
13	do with evaluating the specific messages that are
14	submitted to us by the producer. They may have come
15	from the underwriter or may have been produced by the
16	producer.
17	But in any event, they have to
18	Q Let me interrupt you just to ask if, as
19	you proceed, are you referring now to the rules that
20	begin at page 16 of this document?
21	A Yes, that's correct.
22	Q Could you just very quickly point out some

of the most salient features of those rules as they 1 2 apply to PBS national fed programming? 3 Α Yes. Sort of taking them in sequence, rule one 4 5 is important because what it says is, no matter how well you may comply with rule two to end, at the end 6 7 of the day, we can still reject an announcement for being too commercial even though you may have complied 8 9 technically with all the rules. 10 Going on to specifics on the next page, on page 17 in the middle of the page, for example, you 11 12 see, what, 15 words. These are words that the FCC and various rulings with respect to individual stations 13 have found to be impermissible. 14 15 And so these, for example, are words that cannot be used in the copy or in the script to 16 17 accompany a particular underwriting credit. 18 the page to the top of page 18, you'll see recited there a number of specific prohibitions underwriting 19 20 credits on PBS. 21 And by and large, by the way, these 22 reflect the FCC's regulations; but we, of course,

repeat them here. But among them are it would be 1 2 impermissible to include a call to action, and you see 3 the example "Get Met. It Pays." 4 You cannot use superlative descriptions or qualitative claims about a company, its product or its 5 6 You're not allowed to make 7 comparisons with other companies or with other 8 companies' products or services. 9 Price value information is ornot permitted, nor are inducements to buy, sell, rent or 10 11 lease. And then -- and those are all FCC regulations. 12 We've added endorsements. We would not permit an 13 endorsement to be part of a PBS underwriting credit. 14 Going on in the next page, page 19, 15 Section F, Use of People -- one of the things we sharply limit is the -- try to anyway is the use of 16 17 actors in underwriting credits because that, almost 18 without exception, is, in my mind, the difference 19 between an announcement identifying an underwriter and

And so, for example, we allow a product to

something that gets much closer to an impermissible

commercial.

20

21

be demonstrated, but you can only show hands or feet if it's a pair of shoes, for example, rather than seeing an entire person. But we make an exception for automobile drivers, it being worse to have a car moving without a driver than with one.

And you can see that we quickly get to angels on pin heads with some of these regulations. But in the end, the idea is to enable the company to identify itself and get fair credit for its contribution, but do so in a way that preserves the noncommercial character of public television.

We also allow people to be shown as to reflect a target population. One of the problems one sector of underwriters has, and I'm thinking of insurance companies, for example; they're interested in providing a product or a service that's valuable to a target population.

But we'll allow the use of people to represent that target population as distinct from being customers or employees. Again, these are just, you know, some of the examples of some of the limitations we impose.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	Q You had yesterday if I may interrupt,
2	you had yesterday responded to a question from Mr.
3	Schaeffer relating to the permission to use 800
4	numbers and Web addresses. And you were attempting,
5	I think, to give a series of reasons, only one of
6	which came out on cross examination, for the move in
7	that direction.
8	Would you like to expand on your answer
9	from yesterday?
10	MR. SCHAEFFER: This is leading also.
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Do you have a
12	response you want to make?
13	MR. RICH: Sure, Your Honor.
14	The record will show that the witness said
15	there are several reasons. And after he gave one, he
16	was cut off by Mr. Schaeffer. This is classic
17	redirect to let him contextualize his answer.
18	MR. SCHAEFFER: It's not classic redirect.
19	Frankly, I didn't cut him off and it's not class
20	redirect to lead the witness.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: The objection's
22	overruled.

THE WITNESS: What I was going to say yesterday and didn't get a chance to is that we -there came a point in time when we encountered potential underwriters whose business is -- with whom you could only do business through an 800 number.

And so these were companies -- I'm trying to remember more detail. But, in any event, the only

And so these were companies -- I'm trying to remember more detail. But, in any event, the only way they could identify their product or their service was to say the XYZ Company who provides an 800 number service and wanted to provide their 800 number, and that seemed to us to be not inconsistent with the objective here.

And that was another of the reasons that was brought -- you know, came into play when we decided to change the rule allowing 800 numbers.

Another reason was that early on, in the last 1980's when these rules were first put together by PBS, we were -- telephone numbers are explicitly permitted by the Commission, and that makes sense in a local context when you have a local company with a local telephone number.

But putting a telephone number on a

NEAL R. GROSS

nationally distributed underwriting credit, we were concerned that that might actually be regarded as a call to action. By virtue of putting up the number, are we saying call now 1-800 this and such?

But there was enough dicta from the FCC

But there was enough dicta from the FCC over the period since 1988 to persuade us that that was not a concern, and so we also -- that was another reason that we allowed 800 numbers.

I think the only other point I would want to make is with respect to children's programs over on page 23 and 24. And I think the key point here is that not only are our guidelines more conservative than what the Commission would allow, our guidelines with respect to children's programs are more conservative than what we allow for other day parts or for programs intended for other audiences.

And specifically, if -- you know, if there is a -- if the underwriting message is directed to children, then one of the requirements is that the message be limited to a message of support for education or for public television.

So in many -- in as many ways as we can,

NEAL R. GROSS

1	we do try to restrict or constrain or limit the
2	promotional and commercial aspects of underwriting
3	credits again to maintain the separation the
4	distinction between public broadcasting and commercial
5	broadcasting.
6	BY MR. RICH:
7	Q You were asked a series of questions
8	mostly yesterday about pledge drives. Do you recall?
9	A Yes.
10	Q Are pledge drives a recent phenomenon?
11	A Heavens no. They go back to the 1970's.
12	Q And is the showing of special programming
13	during pledge drives a recent phenomenon?
14	MR. SCHAEFFER: I object. Again, it's
15	just leading the witness. I don't know if Mr. Rich is
16	testifying about it.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: The objection is
18	sustained.
19	BY MR. RICH:
20	Q What, in your experience, characterizes
21	the programming that's offered during pledge periods?
22	A There are essentially two kinds of
- 1	

1	programming. One of the things we do is include in
2	pledge drives our regular continuing series, but we
3	certainly also try to incorporate into those drives
4	what I'll call special programs which hopefully
5	attract press attention and audience attention to
6	bring viewers to participate in the pledge experience.
7	Q Now if you could put in front of you
8	another document introduced yesterday which is ASCAP
9	12X, which is a news piece from <u>Public Broadcasting</u>
10	Report.
11	A Yes.
12	Q Do you see in the first paragraph there is
13	a reference to a \$50 million dollar pledge drive yield
14	for what is reported to be the prior year which I take
15	to be 1996?
16	Do you see that?
17	A I see that.
18	Q To your knowledge, does that sound about
19	right to you in terms of the level of pledge monies
20	achieved system-wide?
21	A That sounds about right to me, yes.
22	Q I'd ask you to look over while you keep
	l !

that number handy, please at PB 4 in the booklet.
And if you would turn to FY1996 figures which are at
the back of that booklet at Table 2.
A Yes.
Q And am I correct that reportable gross
income for the television system for FY1996 as there
reported is about \$1.48 billion dollars?
A Yes.
Q How would one go about determining the
percentage of total system income that reported pledge
money represented?
A Well, pledge money is included in the
larger category of membership money. As we see here,
membership money for that year was \$327 million. And
as this Exhibit 12X reports, pledge total pledge
revenues for that year were on the order of \$50
million dollars.
So \$50 million divided by \$327 million
would be their proportion of
Q Roughly 15%?
A If thank you for doing the math.
Q Of membership income?

1	A Of total okay, 15% of membership income
2	is attributable to pledge activities.
3	Q And if we wanted to know what percent
4	pledge activity in 1996 represented of total
5	television system income, I take it the ratio would be
6	\$50 million in the numerator and \$1.48 billion in the
7	denominator?
8	A Yes.
9	MR. SCHAEFFER: I object.
10	MR. RICH: Which, by my math, is three
11	percent?
12	MR. SCHAEFFER: This is just leading
L3	this is just argument in the form of a witness. He's
L4	leading on his direct.
15	MR. RICH: These numbers we're dividing
16	numbers. I mean, it's not a big deal.
L7	MR. SCHAEFFER: Well, it happens that you
18	didn't establish the predicate of whether the
19	accounting system is the same, which is something we
20	discussed.
21	MR. RICH: Well, you can
22	MR. SCHAEFFER: I know. But, I mean, it's
- 1	

1	not the proper way to ask a question.
2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: It's been asked and
3	answered at this point, Mr. Schaeffer.
4	MR. SCHAEFFER: I withdraw the objection.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: We'll consider any
6	further objections as you pose them.
7	BY MR. RICH:
8	Q You testified yesterday to Federal
9	appropriations I believe for FY2000 now confirmed at
10	\$300 million dollars, is that correct?
11	A I'm trying to recall if I was thinking it
12	was '99 or 2000, but \$300 million is the right number.
13	Q Do you know, sir, how that appropriation
14	relates to prior year appropriations dating back into
15	the into prior periods?
16	A I believe well, if 2000 is \$300
17	million, then '99 is \$275 million and '98 is \$250
18	million, I believe.
19	Q Let me ask you to look at a page from Ms.
20	Jameson's testimony which is to the rear of the direct
21	testimony to see if that may refresh you recollection.
22	Specifically page eight of Ms. Jameson's testimony.

1	A Yes.
2	Q Do those figures comport, sir, with your
3	recollection as to
4	A I'm sorry, these
5	Q where the \$300 million dollars fits in
6	the historic pattern of appropriation?
7	A Well, they don't appear here so it must be
8	FY2000.
9	Yes, as indicated in the footnote, the
10	\$300 million is I'm not sure of the date of all of
11	this, but
12	Q Okay, let me finally ask you a couple of
13	questions about a document which is in evidence as
14	ASCAP 14X, the PBS 1997 Annual Report. If you could
15	pull that out again, please.
16	And if you would specifically look at page
17	two up at the top. Mr. Schaeffer read you certain
18	excepts from the financial highlights paragraph there.
19	Do you recall?
20	A Yes.
21	Q And I'd like specifically to direct your
22	attention to the statement toward the middle of that

1	paragraph which says, "FY1997 operating revenue was up
2	by almost \$32 million dollars over FY1996 due largely
3	to growth in PBS's Learning Ventures activities such
4	as PBS The Business Channel, PBS Home Video and the
5	PBS Adult Learning Service."
6	Do you see that?
7	A I do.
8	Q Now to what extent are the identified
9	activities there broadcast activities, to your
10	knowledge?
11	A The Business Channel does not engage in
12	any broadcast activities. PBS Home Video, by
13	definition, is home video and not broadcast. The
14	Adult Learning Service has both a broadcast and a
15	satellite component.
16	Part of it is entails broadcast, but
17	part of it is direct feed of college course ware from
18	PBS directly to colleges bypassing any broadcast
19	phase.
20	O I have one last question on regiment
	Q I have one last question on redirect.
21	In that same paragraph, Mr. Downey I'm

1	A Yes.
2	Q Page two. There's a sentence that says,
3	"The net effect was an increase in investments in
4	future programming of \$18 million dollars, a 16%
5	rise."
6	Do you see that?
7	A No. Where is that?
8	Q Down in that same paragraph, financial
9	highlights,
10	A Oh, yes.
11	Q the next to last sentence. The
12	reference to investments in future programming of \$18
13	million dollars. Do you see that?
14	A I'm just reading the
15	Q Yes.
16	A Yes.
17	Q Can you put that number in the context of
18	total PBS programming investments as well as system-
19	wide programming investments?
20	A The PBS program budget for fiscal '97, if
21	I'm not mistaken, was around \$120 million dollars or
22	so or would have been otherwise. And this \$18

1	million increased it to approximately \$140 million or
2	\$138 million.
3	And that is that's the PBS portion of
4	total program spending on national programs of \$300
5	million. So PBS accounts for a little less than half
6	of the total amount spent on national programs.
7	Elsewhere, we discussed the total amount spent system-
8	wide on programming by both local stations and through
9	PBS, which was in the realm of \$670 million dollars.
10	So that getting back to your question,
11	the \$18 million then is a relatively small proportion
12	of all of the amounts spent on programming by all of
13	the stations system-wide.
14	Q Thank you.
15	MR. RICH: I have no further questions.
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right.
17	MR. SCHAEFFER: I have several.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: I had wondered why
19	you had moved up here, Mr. Schaeffer.
20	MR. SCHAEFFER: Bad news, I guess.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Go right ahead,
22	please.

<u> </u>	RECROSS EXAMINATION
2	MR. SCHAEFFER: I certainly hope to finish
3	before lunch. I'm pretty sure I will.
4	I'd like to just mark for identification
5	as ASCAP Exhibit 18X a copy of a little tombstone that
6	appears or an article that appears in <u>Current</u> of March
7	2, 1998.
8	And you can give it to the witness.
9	I think it's 18, Your Honor.
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Okay, 18X.
11	(Whereupon, the above-mentioned
12	document was marked as ASCAP
13	Exhibit 18X for
14	identification.)
15	MR. SCHAEFFER: If you would take a second
16	to read this, Mr. Downey.
17	What would a day be without a <u>Current</u>
18	article for me?
19	JUDGE DREYFUS: Are we reading outside the
20	box or inside the box?
21	MR. SCHAEFFER: Outside the box. I said
22	in the tombstone. I'm sorry.

1	MR. KLEINBERG: Inside the box.
2	MR. SCHAEFFER: I'm sorry, inside. I'm
3	sorry, inside the box. I'm sorry. I apologize.
4	One thing that hasn't changed is my
5	confusion.
6	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
7	Q Have you seen this before?
8	A No.
9	Q Okay. This is the same Ms. Bedford, I
10	think, previously identified for us.
11	A Yes.
12	Q The first paragraph says that PBS's
13	proposed financial fiscal 1999 budget sticks to a
14	multi-year strategy to increase program spending by
15	50% over four years while limiting stations' program
16	dues to inflationary increases.
17	That's true, isn't it?
18	A Yes.
19	Q The second paragraph says that station
20	dues comprised a smaller portion of PBS's total
21	budget, 60% down from 75 in 1996.
22	That's true, isn't it?

_	A Yes.
2	Q It is true also that PBS is seeking a five
3	percent increase for member services and SIP fund
4	raising specials.
5	A Right.
6	Q Those would is that correct?
7	A Yes.
8	Q And that SIP fund raising special with
9	those pledges that we talked about yesterday, you have
10	a special department. I think you testified yesterday
11	that it's called SIP that promotes or buys that stuff
12	for them.
13	Okay, then it says the total budget of
14	nearly \$278 million dollars seeks \$126 million from
15	stations and projects, \$93 million dollars in gross
16	revenue from profit generating activities, and PBS
17	predicts that strategic partners will invest \$21 in
18	the National Program Service, almost as much as CPB's
19	annual grant of \$22.5 million.
20	That's true also, isn't it?
21	A Yes.
22	Q Now when it says that strategic partners
- 1	I and the second

1.	will invest \$21 million dollars in the National
2	Program Service, that's for the PBS programs on the
3	PBS feed and all that kind of thing?
4	A Yes.
5	Q And those strategic partners are some of
6	the people you mentioned yesterday, I think; Reader's
7	Digest I think you said Time-Warner, but I'm not
8	sure. Can you remember any others in between now and
9	
10	A Reader's Digest, Warner Brothers Records.
11	Q Okay. And Warner Brothers Records is
12	contributing to the programs?
13	A Yes.
14	Q Okay.
15	MR. RICH: May I interject objections
16	here? I think the recross is on his own cross,
17	certainly not on any redirect.
18	MR. SCHAEFFER: On the contrary, what was
19	raised was that there was a much more constrained
20	financial picture for PBS than we had brought out on
21	cross, and I think it goes directly to that issue.
22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: The objection's

1	overruled.
2	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
3	Q Then it goes on to say, "PBS predicts that
4	strategic partners will invest \$21 million dollars in
5	the National Program Service." And I'm sorry, I
6	repeated that.
7	And then Bob Ottenhoff, COO is that the
8	chief operating officer of PBS?
9	A That is correct.
10	Q Says PBS is "very confident" that it can
11	raise \$20 million dollars by forging new programming
12	alliances despite the loss of Reader's Digest money.
13	So you're making it Reader's Digest no longer
14	contributed, is that right?
15	A Reader's Digest association has suffered
16	some adverse consequences in its other business lines
17	and, as a result, has pulled back on the relationship
18	with PBS. It is not I wouldn't say it will
19	necessarily fall to zero, but it's far less than we
20	had earlier imagined.
21	Q And the next sentence says you're doing
22	negotiating, and I do not wish to pry on your

1	negotiations, and I'm going to leave that. I just
2	assume what it says is true in the balance.
3	In other words, there are a number of very
4	serious discussions. I don't want to get into that,
5	but I assume that's true?
6	A As reported by this article, our goal is
7	to increase by \$20 million dollars the amount of the
8	National Program Service budget.
9	Q Well, and do you agree Ottenhoff says that
10	the organization is very confident it will do that?
11	I don't want to pry into your negotiations
12	because this is a public record, so I assume that's
13	true.
14	A True that we're confident or
15	Q Yes.
16	A We're confident, yes.
17	Q Okay. All right, and I assume the balance
18	about PBS on line of \$1.9 million dollars and the
19	Learning Venture division which includes home video,
20	etc., all that is true, that there will be additional
21	funds substantial due from that?
22	A Right.

1	Q I assume that's true.
2	A Well, this is reporting revenues.
3	Q Yes, I assume that the article is
4	substantially accurate?
5	A The article is substantially accurate.
6	Q Okay. And I assume we'll get to that
7	subject a little later.
8	Now I want to shift to a slightly
9	different matter. And I'm sorry if I jump around, but
10	this is recross and I'm only going to try and confine
11	myself to what happened on your redirect.
12	There was some discussion of formats on
13	your redirect, and I think particularly some of the
14	charts that appeared in I think it's PBS 3 or 4.
15	Forgive me as always, I'm messed up.
16	But I think it was PBS correct me if
17	I'm wrong 6.
18	Now in analyzing music use by formats, has
19	PBS ever undertaken or, for that matter, the
20	Corporation for Public Broadcasting the actual
21	quantity of music that's used in a particular format?
22	MR. RICH: Objection; outside the scope of

1	redirect. There were no questions along these lines
2	whatsoever on redirect.
3	MR. SCHAEFFER: I believe there were
4	references in the cross by Mr. Kleinberg. Now that
5	that raised issues, I think it's perfectly legitimate
6	recross to follow another I mean, I think that's
7	the way the rule is.
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Anything further?
9	MR. RICH: I believe that, after however
10	many hours yesterday, Mr. Schaeffer doesn't have to
11	piggy back on Mr. Kleinberg's cross as a basis for
12	recross. I think that the proper scope of it is to
13	inquire into the areas I covered in the last half an
14	hour to 35 minutes.
15	MR. SCHAEFFER: I don't know, maybe the
16	practice is different in different courts, but I in
17	Manhattan, I know in where I come from, it is the
18	common practice.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: The objection is
20	sustained.
21	MR. SCHAEFFER: I'll move on to another
22	subject. I can't accept there were some questions,
- 1	1

1	I believe, that Mr. Rich then had raised about BMI 2X
2	which is this article that you may recall.
3	THE WITNESS: I recall the article.
4	MR. RICH: I would again
5	MR. SCHAEFFER: My recollection
6	MR. RICH: Let me rise to object. I
7	didn't raise any questions on redirect about that
8	article.
9	MR. SCHAEFFER: Well, I would ask a
10	question one question about the article. I don't
11	know if I really honestly thought
12	MR. RICH: If it's a question, I will
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Let me hear the
14	question.
15	MR. SCHAEFFER: All right, the question
16	is, who would know more about music use in 1998 on PBS
17	national programming, you or a gentleman who has got
18	the job of director of drama, performance and the
19	arts?
20	MR. RICH: I don't object to that.
21	THE WITNESS: Mr. DuBose would know more
22	than I.

1	MR. SCHAEFFER: Thank you.
2	You've testified, I believe, on direct
3	and again, my memory isn't as good as apparently I
4	thought it was about studies that were done of
5	and which were included in the evidence you gave or
6	PBS gave to this Panel.
7	Do you recall that? I believe I'm correct
8	on that there was an exhibit
9	MR. KLEINBERG: Would you be referring to
10	the research notes?
11	MR. SCHAEFFER: Yeah, they were research
12	notes, that's right.
13	THE WITNESS: So there is some CPB
14	research
15	MR. SCHAEFFER: That's what I said, yeah,
16	that were done by CPB or PBS or one of the people in
17	this case.
18	MR. RICH: I would object. There was no
19	eliciting of testimony on redirect concerning that
20	exhibit either.
21	MR. SCHAEFFER: Really? I thought that
22	that I'm pretty confident the record will bear me out.

1	There was reference to the program information
2	notebook, and I think Mr. Rich asked a couple of
3	questions about that.
4	Am I incorrect? I just don't have the
5	record so I don't know, but I thought he asked
6	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Mr. Kleinberg cross
7	examined on that.
8	MR. SCHAEFFER: I see, okay.
9	Well, I would ask some questions about
10	that, but am I not to be permitted that?
11	MR. RICH: We would object.
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: The objection's
13	sustained.
14	MR. SCHAEFFER: I'm sorry, I apologize.
15	Would you well, let's talk about
16	something that I know that we went into on cross, if
17	I could find my document, and that was the guidelines.
18	Is that back there, Joan?
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: 14X?
20	MR. RICH: 4X, Your Honor.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Oh, here it is.
22	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:

1	Q All right, I'll ask you I had some
2	questions about the guidelines that I know Mr. Rich
3	went over. Here they are.
4	If you'd put 4X because I was a little
5	unclear about some of the matter.
6	You said that there's great emphasis on
7	the fact that no viewer should think that advertisers
8	influence the content of the shows, and that's a
9	distinctive feature of public television broadcasting;
10	is that correct?
11	A I would put it a different way.
12	Q Well, don't put it a different way. Is
13	that do you regard
14	A The emphasis
15	Q one of the no, please put it my way,
16	sir. I'm the questioner; you're the witness.
17	MR. RICH: I object. There's no
18	requirement that the witness put it the examiner's
19	way.
20	MR. SCHAEFFER: No, but there's no
21	there is a requirement that he answer the question.
22	If he wants to answer a different question, you'll ask

1	it for him.
2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Can you respond to
3	the question as it was asked, sir?
4	THE WITNESS: May I ask to repeat the
5	question?
6	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
7	Q Do you regard the requirement that there
8	be an identification withdraw.
9	Do you regard the requirement that news
10	programs not appear to be influenced by commercial
11	advertisers as unique to public broadcasting?
12	A No.
13	Q In fact, when we watch 60 Minutes and
14	20/20 and Dateline, it's pretty clear from watching
15	that that the commercials do not the sponsors do
16	not influence those programs, isn't that correct?
17	A Commercial programs don't have
18	underwriters, so it's a different I mean, it's a
19	different model, it's a different, you know, paradigm.
20	I mean, I accept your assertion that they don't have
21	influence over the content, but the relationship
22	between the producer and the sponsor is different in

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	commercial television.
2	Q You would regard a sponsor for example,
3	how about I know a show called The Hallmark
4	Playhouse, I think it's called. Is that a different
5	that's not an underwriter in, you know, commercial
6	television program
7	A No, you asked me about news programs, so
8	that's what I was referring to.
9	Q Well, do you regard, for example, 60
LO	Minutes, when it has advertisers who come and pay for
L1	the pay for minutes for their announcements on that
L2	broadcast, as not really paying for the broadcast?
L3	A I'm sorry, now you've asked me a different
L4	we're on a different subject.
L5	Could you repeat the question?
L6	Q You distinguish yeah, we are because
L7	I'm puzzled.
L8	In other words, an advertiser is different
L9	even though the advertiser pays money on a commercial
20	program to defray to pay the expenses, the profits,
21	the salaries, everything of the everything that
22	costs money on a particular program, that's different

1	than an underwriter in public television, sometimes
2	called a sponsor, who pays money which is then used
3	for the expenses and the salaries of public
4	broadcasting programs, is that correct?
5	MR. RICH: Objection.
6	MR. SCHAEFFER: You do?
7	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: He's answered. Do
8	you want go ahead.
9	MR. SCHAEFFER: Okay.
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Do you want to
11	answer?
12	THE WITNESS: I have an answer, yes.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Do you object?
14	MR. RICH: I'll withdraw my objection.
15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right, go ahead
16	and answer.
17	THE WITNESS: There are similarities there
18	and very important differences. In public television,
19	by and large well, no exclusively it's the
20	producer who finds the underwriting. And so the
21	producer delivers to PBS a package consisting of the
22	program and the underwriting.

1	And PBS have no involvement in the under
2	in the producer's solicitation of that underwriter.
3	And so we have certain safeguards to ensure that
4	what's delivered to us meets with our standards.
5	Now this is different from a commercial
6	network who has in one department producers making
7	programs and, in another department, an advertising
8	sales department selling commercial spots.
9	And it's all conducted within the
10	framework of one corporation with, you know, obviously
11	a hierarchy of management and the exercise of
12	responsibilities. So that's a difference.
1.3	And it is one of the reasons for this, you
14	know, fairly elaborate articulation of underwriting
15	guideline policies.
1.6	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
17	Q Is it your testimony that networks like
18	NBC and CBS do not review and regulate the content of
19	the shows that come out on their feeds?
20	A I don't think that's what I said. I said
21	
22	Q Well, I don't know what you sir, I'm

1	trying to find out what you did say.
2	What's the difference?
3	A The difference is that PBS is a third
4	party in the transaction, unlike a network who is
5	you know, who has control over both the selling of the
6	advertising time and the production of the news
7	program.
8	Q So that's the difference between the
9	hypothetical I gave you
10	A Well, that's a difference.
11	Q Is there any other difference that's
12	important? I understand you think that difference is
13	significant. Others may disagree.
14	A I think there are profound differences
15	between public
16	Q Well, tell me what they are.
17	A Well, as I've said before, public
18	television, the emphasis is on the program, not on
19	attracting large audiences for the purposes of selling
20	advertising.
21	Q Do you distinguish 60 Minutes or the news
22	magazines that I've described, 20/20, as from

1	Frontline in that respect?
2	A In terms of program content, there are
3	high degrees of similarity; but we were talking here,
4	I thought, about underwriting and these guidelines and
5	why they're
6	Q Well, I'm talking about who pays for the
7	shows. Advertisers clearly pay for 60 Minutes. 60
8	Minutes, you must agree, would not run if they didn't
9	have advertisers, isn't that correct?
10	A That's correct.
11	Q Okay. And so the money that they get from
12	advertising on CBS, I guess, carries 60 Minutes
13	in essence goes to paying for 60 Minutes and whatever
14	profits the shareholders of CBS get, isn't that
15	correct?
16	A That's correct.
17	And underwriters pay for PBS programs.
18	And we have certain guidelines to ensure satisfy
19	ourselves and our viewers of the relationship between
20	the producer and the underwriter.
21	Q And what I'm saying to you, isn't it
22	pretty clear that the news magazines on and the

1	news, in fact, on national television also screens, to
2	some extent, what is reported so it will not look like
3	the advertisers are influencing the content, isn't
4	that true?
5	Don't you know that in the broadcasting
6	industry?
7	A I think that it's I don't know, to be
8	honest with you.
9	Q You don't?
10	A I think it's
11	Q Okay, you don't know. Fine.
12	Incidentally, when you even see Mad About
13	You or Seinfeld on the national networks, is there
14	anything that indicates or any danger that the
15	sponsors particularly influence those situation
16	comedies?
17	Is there any reason that we would think
18	that?
19	A I don't believe that's the case, but I
20	don't I can't
21	Q Okay. Let's go back and let's look at a
22	little more I think I got the right one some of

1	the rules that are contained in 4X. Look at page 17.
2	And there are some words that the FCC has found
3	unacceptable which you're warning the local stations,
4	right?
5	A Yes.
6	Q Okay. For example, delightfully honest;
7	do you think it makes a difference if it says honest?
8	A Well, I have to be careful about context.
9	That was the word cited in the Commission's letter of
10	liability to a station, that it shouldn't have said
11	delightfully honest.
12	And so I'm doing the best I can.
13	Q Okay, okay.
14	So what you're doing is reporting
15	you're reporting really what the FCC said should not
16	be done?
17	A That's right.
18	Q It really isn't PBS that's announcing the
19	policy; you're repeating certain words that were found
20	inappropriate by the FCC?
21	A It's a literal transcript.
22	Q Okay, I understand that.

1	By the way, what is enhanced underwriting?
2	A Uh
3	Q That's a term that's used in public
4	broadcasting?
5	A Yes.
6	Q What does that mean?
7	A It's not a very precise term, but it has
8	its origins in an experiment conducted by something
9	called the Temporary Commission on Alternate
LO	Financing, or TCAF, which occurred in the early
L1	1980's.
L2	And under that experiment, some ten public
L3	television stations, although only seven actually
L4	undertook the opportunity, actually ran commercials
L5	for a period of 18 months.
L6	Literal TV commercials behaved in that
L7	respect, at least, as commercial stations for the
L8	purpose of ascertaining what the consequences might be
L9	of doing that on a more widespread fashion.
20	Meanwhile, some other one or two other
21	stations elected not to go all the way to commercials,
22	but to show more traditional underwriting

1	announcements, but announcements that were more
2	aggressive than what was then permitted by the FCC.
3	And the term of art used to describe that
4	was enhanced underwriting. Again, it's not a very
5	precise term, but that's how and where it came about.
6	Q Is it your understanding that some of the
7	local television stations in public broadcasting are
8	continuing forms of enhanced advertising?
9	A Well,
10	Q I'm sorry, enhanced underwriting.
11	A A couple of years later, after this TCAF
12	experiment, the Congress directed the Commission to
13	amend its rules so that they were more permissive with
14	respect to underwriting credits.
15	And the rules that the Commission now has
16	in place allow what you might call enhanced
17	underwriting.
18	Q Look at D on page 18. I'm not I'm a
19	little confused about what this means. Does this mean
20	that, on a particular announcement, an underwriter can
21	say could identify its product?
22	A Yes.

1	Q And is that substantially different than
2	withdrawn, okay.
3	But he can't mention more than one
4	product; only one product?
5	A The PBS guidelines would limit you to
6	identifying one product and up to three product lines.
7	Q I see. But
8	A The Commission regulations don't impose
9	that limitation.
10	Q I see. So if somebody mentioned two
11	products and four product lines, it would be
12	inconsistent. But if he mentions only one, he's okay
13	under PBS guidelines?
14	A Yes.
15	Q Then I see product demonstrations. Under
16	PBS's restrictions, you can actually identify how a
17	product works by if you're an underwriter or a PBS
18	sponsor?
19	A Yes.
20	Q When you say demonstrate a product, what
21	do you mean?
22	A Well, for example, a kitchen appliance.

1	You know, a food processor, for example.
2	Q I see.
3	A You could show it in operation.
4	Q And it says for these purposes, packaged
5	goods such as food may be shown out of the package or
6	container?
7	A Yes.
8	Q So you can show a piece of Wonder bread
9	being taken out of the Wonder bread package, in other
LO	words?
L1	A You could show that, yes.
L2	Q Okay. And I take it in page 19, when you
L3	were talking about the restrictions on the use of
L4	people, if I have if I'm an automobile manufacturer
.5	say I'm Ford or Chrysler, I can show some happy or
16	remember the old Tour the USA in a Chevrolet?
L7	I don't know if everybody remembers that.
L8	I think you and I remember that.
.9	You can show somebody behind the wheel
20	going way high and Tour the USA in a Chevrolet
21	that's okay?
22	A No.

Q I see. What's not okay?
A You started to say some happy person.
That's exactly the problem here.
Q Yeah.
A I acknowledge that it would look very
strange for a car again to be to have nobody
driving it, so we'll allow a driver of a car. But
they can't be shown in close up. They're not allowed
to wave.
Q I see.
A No hair blowing in the wind. No
beautiful, buxom models. All of that is not
permitted.
Q But they can you can see the you can
see the Chevrolet coming up to you with a smiling
driver in the background coming closer?
A No; no smiling drivers.
Q The driver can't smile?
A Yes, that's correct.
Q Okay, all right, okay.
A We're trying to avoid a depiction of the
happy consumer

1	Q Right, no happy faces.
2	A implying that this product is superior
3	to some other product.
4	Q I see, no happy faces.
5	A You can show the product.
6	Q Okay. Now I noticed you can use jingles.
7	A Uh-huh.
8	Q That's on page 21. And those are it
9	says a jingle. What do you understand a jingle to be?
10	A A piece of music that is associated with
11	a particular company.
12	Q Okay. So, for example, Tour the USA in a
13	Chevrolet, you might not use the lyrics; you'd just to
14	the tune?
15	A We might.
16	Q Yeah, okay. And
17	A So long as the overall effect preserves
18	the noncommercial character of the announcement.
19	Q And in fact, if NBC chose to be on PBS,
20	you might have the famous NBC blah, blah, blah,
21	whatever that is, right?
22	A I'd have to think about that.

1	Q Yeah, well, what would the objection be?
2	It's not a lyric.
3	A I'd have to think about that.
4	Q Okay. But the local TV station,
5	notwithstanding your thinking about it, could assume
6	that that was okay?
7	A Probably okay. It's a little unusual in
8	that NBC and other broadcasters
9	Q Well, you've never how many times have
10	you gone to local stations and told them they're
11	messing up and they're not performing what they're
12	supposed to be doing under these rules?
13	A Never.
14	Q Oh. Never?
15	A Local stations come to us for guidance,
16	and we provide it as requested. But we are not we
17	are not compliance officers of local stations.
18	Q So that, in point of fact, if the local
19	station said I don't care, nothing would happen?
20	A That is correct.
21	Q It's precatory?
22	A That's correct.

1	Q In	fact, if they don't have it on their
2	files, they do	n't even know what happens?
3	MR	. RICH: Objection.
4	TH	E WITNESS: I'm sorry, I don't know what
5	you mean by fi	les.
6	MR	. SCHAEFFER: Okay.
7	СН	AIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Sustained.
8	ВУ	MR. SCHAEFFER:
9	Q Le	t's move on to something besides the
10	precatory rule	s.
11	MR	. RICH: May I move to strike that last
12	ubiquitous com	ment?
	11	
13	MR	. SCHAEFFER: Yeah, okay; where's my
13	MR letter?	. SCHAEFFER: Yeah, okay; where's my
	letter?	. SCHAEFFER: Yeah, okay; where's my AIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right.
14	letter? CH	
14	letter? CH	AIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right RICH: Can I get a ruling before Mr.
14 15 16	letter? CH MR Schaeffer shou	AIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right RICH: Can I get a ruling before Mr.
14 15 16 17	letter? CH MR Schaeffer shou MR	AIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. RICH: Can I get a ruling before Mr. ts over me?
14 15 16 17	letter? CH MR Schaeffer shou MR CH	AIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. RICH: Can I get a ruling before Mr. ts over me? . SCHAEFFER: I'll withdraw it.
14 15 16 17 18	letter? CH MR Schaeffer shou MR CH MR	AIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. . RICH: Can I get a ruling before Mr. ts over me? . SCHAEFFER: I'll withdraw it. AIRPERSON GRIFFITH: It's stricken.

_	Cite wichess I/A:
2	Now I asked you some questions about this
3	yesterday, but I'm and one question I'm going to
4	repeat because I didn't seem to understand from your
5	questioning by Mr. Rich if you're disaffirming it, and
6	I just want to make sure that this letter for Congress
7	is not being disaffirmed.
8	MR. RICH: I object. I did not ask him
9	any questions about this letter or whether he was
LO	disaffirming this letter.
.1	MR. SCHAEFFER: You asked about national
L2	programming. You asked a lot about national
13	programming.
_4	MR. RICH: You could probably I asked
-5	him about PBS and that word appears here too, Your
.6	Honors, but that's not the issue.
.7	MR. SCHAEFFER: Well, there's a statement
.8	here PBS's future is directly tied to its programming,
.9	"our national programming enjoying extraordinary
20	successes in 1997." I want to find out if that's
21	still his opinion.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Do you object?

22

1	MR. RICH: Mr. Schaeffer's all over the
2	lot. He asked if the predicate, I thought, for his
3	question was whether he was "disavowing" this letter,
4	which I think would be well outside the scope of my
5	redirect.
6	MR. SCHAEFFER: No, disavowing this
7	paragraph.
8	JUDGE GULIN: All right, we'll strike the
9	introductory clause.
10	MR. SCHAEFFER: Okay.
11	. JUDGE GULIN: And re-ask the question.
12	MR. SCHAEFFER: Are you disavowing that
13	which was said and reported to Congress in
14	justification of the bonuses which appears as the
15	third bullet point on page three?
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Any objection?
17	MR. RICH: May I I just want to read
18	it.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right.
20	THE WITNESS: The third bullet point on
21	page three?
22	MR. SCHAEFFER. Yes

1	THE WITNESS: We didn't discuss that
2	yesterday.
3	MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes, we did. I asked
4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Just a moment.
5	THE WITNESS: We discussed the first
6	bullet on page two.
7	MR. RICH: Whether or not it was discussed
8	yesterday, Your Honors, it certainly wasn't discussed
9	on redirect today.
10	MR. SCHAEFFER: Well certainly national
11	programming was.
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: It was.
13	JUDGE GULIN: Let me read the
14	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Yes.
15	JUDGE GULIN: We're talking about the last
16	bullet
17	MR. SCHAEFFER: On page three.
18	JUDGE GULIN: Page three.
19	THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, are you waiting
20	for me to
21	MR. SCHAEFFER: I'm asking is the
22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: No, wait just a

1	minute. There's an objection pending.
2	Do you have any comments to make?
3	JUDGE DREYFUS: The objection is based on
4	
5	MR. RICH: Outside the scope of redirect.
6	JUDGE DREYFUS: outside the scope of
7	redirect?
8	MR. RICH: Yes, sir.
9	JUDGE DREYFUS: Is it your position that
10	he that the subject matter of this bullet point was
11	brought up on redirect?
12	MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes.
13	JUDGE DREYFUS: The subject
14	MR. SCHAEFFER: They discussed the
15	financial constraint on national programming. It's my
16	last question.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: By a vote of two to
18	one, the objection is overruled.
19	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
20	Q You don't contest the truth of the bullet
21	point that appears the third bullet point that
22	appears on page three?

1	A No, I don't contest the truth of it.
2	Q And in fact, one of the reasons for the
3	station equity model by which your partnering of the
4	business enterprises in using the programs that you
5	are acquiring which include music as a way of getting
6	revenues is designed to increase the revenues of PBS
7	because it fears that there will be a decline in
8	future contributions and pledges and Federal funding,
9	isn't that true?
10	MR. RICH: Objection. Mr. Schaeffer
11	represented he had but one question on this document.
12	MR. SCHAEFFER: Oh, come on.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: He can go ahead and
14	pursue.
15	Go ahead, if you wish.
16	Can you answer that question, sir?
17	THE WITNESS: I would answer this way.
18	The essential reason for the station equity model was
19	to relieve the burden on our stations of increasing
20	the funds available for National Program Service.
21	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
22	Q I think you may have misspoke. Can I hear

| that --

A The essential reason for the station equity model was to relieve the burden of increases coming from our member stations. In other words, it enabled our member stations' contributions to the National Program Service to remain basically flat plus an adjustment for inflation.

Q In other words, you feared that the revenues that were going to be achieved by your stations from the Federal Government, from contributions, from pledges, from all the many, many fund raising activities that they engage in might not be enough for them in the future, isn't that true?

A No. Well, I -- no.

As I've said numerous times, all of the economic indicators are basically flat. But our stations agree that it's important to continue to invest whatever we can in national programming.

To the extent the stations are enjoying some level of growth, they are investing it in things other than national programming in part in order to strengthen their -- the value of -- strengthen the

	audience's perceived value of the station in the
2	community by providing things like outreach or doing
3	more local programming.
4	Q Well, but these things that the station
5	equity model are engaging in are producing profits,
6	aren't they?
7	A No, they're producing programs.
8	Q Aren't they also producing a lot of money?
9	Mr. Duggan says so. They're producing a lot of
10	additional revenue for PBS and for the public
11	broadcasting industry. Isn't that clear from
12	everything we've seen?
13	A Well, we talked about \$18 million dollars
14	which is invested in programs. It's not dollars that
15	are, you know, passed out amongst the stations or
16	something.
17	MR. SCHAEFFER: I'll stand on the
18	documents that are already in okay, I have no
19	further questions.
20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right.
21	Mr. Kleinberg, you do not have any cross
22	examination?
- 1	

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	MR. KLEINBERG: I do not.
2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Thank you.
3	MR. RICH: One remaining question, if I
4	may.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Mr. Rich.
6	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
7	BY MR. RICH:
8	Q Mr. Downey, you testified in response to
9	Mr. Schaeffer that there came a time when the Congress
10	effectively instructed the FCC to expand a bit the
11	latitude for underwriting guidelines, is that right?
12	A That's correct.
13	Q What year was that approximately, to your
14	recollection?
15	A 1984.
16	MR. RICH: I have no further questions.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right.
18	May this witness be excused?
19	MR. SCHAEFFER: As far as I'm concerned.
20	MR. RICH: Thank you, yes.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Mr. Downey, sir,
	- ' '

1	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
2	(Laughter.)
3	(The witness was excused.)
4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Wasn't there a song
5	called Free at Last?
6	We'll take our lunch and recess. I'll ask
7	that you come back at 2:00, please.
8	MR. SCHAEFFER: Mr. Jabelow is next?
9	MR. RICH: Yes.
10	(Whereupon, the proceedings recessed for
11	lunch at 12:55 p.m.)
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

1	A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N
2	(2:05 p.m.)
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right, ladies
4	and gentlemen. Mr. Rich, are you ready, sir?
5	MR. RICH: Yes. Just one housekeeping
6	matter, if I may.
7	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Yes.
8	MR. RICH: In response to a question posed
9	by Your Honor yesterday as to the status of the
10	paperwork, withdrawing the motion to strike certain
11	testimony by Dr. Boyle,
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Yes.
13	MR. RICH: I want to tender to the
14	Panel copies of a stipulation which has now been
15	entered into among the parties reflecting the
16	conditions and circumstances happily agreed to between
17	the parties, based on which the motion is withdrawn.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. Thank
19	you. For the record, I'll simply mark this as
20	"Received" today, then.
21	MR. RICH: Thank you.
22	And with the Panel's permission, we would
l	

1	call as our next witness Peter Jablow.
2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. Mr.
3	Jablow, if you'll raise your right hand, please, sir?
4	Whereupon,
5	PETER JABLOW
6	was called as a witness by counsel for the Public
7	Broadcasters and, having been first duly sworn,
8	assumed the witness stand, was examined, and testified
9	as follows:
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Thank you.
11	DIRECT EXAMINATION
12	BY MR. RICH:
13	Q Mr. Jablow, would you state your name for
14	the record, please?
15	A Peter Jablow.
16	Q And by whom are you employed?
17	A National Public Radio.
18	Q What is your current position at NPR?
19	A I'm the Executive Vice President and Chief
20	Operating Officer.
21	Q For how long have you held that position?
22	A Three years.

1	Q What are the responsibilities that
2	position entails?
3	A I oversee the day-to-day operations of the
4	company, which includes all of the outputs and the
5	basic operations of NPR.
6	Q And would you briefly describe your
7	principal job experiences before joining NPR three
8	years ago?
9	A Yes. I came to Washington. I'll sort of
LO	trace it in two different ways. I came to Washington
L1	in 1978 to become the first Executive Director of a
L2	nonprofit trade association for the arts and
L3	entertainment industry: the Cultural Alliance. I did
4	that for five years.
L5	And after that, I went to work for Abe
L6	Pollin, a gentleman who owns the Washington Capitals
.7	and the Washington Wizards and now called the MCI
L8	Center.
.9	And through my background in the arts and
20	entertainment industry, I got Mr. Pollin involved in
21	the ticketing business, commercial ticketing business.
22	And I ran the Mid-Atlantic franchise for the

1	Ticketmaster operation, which he owned the license
2	for. And ultimately we along with some venture
3	partners bought Ticketron nationally. And I became
4	the President and CEO of Ticketron.
5	Once we sold that company, I went and
6	established my own consulting business in the
7	communications and entertainment field for a number of
8	years. National Public Radio was one of my clients.
9	I ended up becoming the COO.
10	Prior to that, I worked in Boston in the
11	arts and entertainment, nonprofit arts and
12	entertainment, area as well.
13	Q I was going to ask you about some prior
14	involvement I believe you had with a variety of
15	cultural organizations.
16	A Well, I've always had an involvement with
17	cultural organizations from my days in Boston through
18	my days now in Washington. I'm the Chairman of the
19	Board of the Roundhouse Theatre Company. I'm the
20	Treasurer of the Washington Theatre Awards Society,
21	the Helen Hayes Awards.

Before that, I was President of the Woolly

1	Mammoth Theatre. And in Boston, I was involved
2	similarly in the theatre community in the nonprofit
3	cultural world.
4	Q What is your educational background?
5	A I have an undergraduate degree from the
6	University of Pennsylvania in psychology and a
7	graduate degree from Boston University in broadcast
8	journalism.
9	Q Do you, sir, have an understanding as to
10	the level of increase over previously negotiated
11	license fees which are being sought by ASCAP and BMI
12	in this proceeding?
13	A Yes, I do.
L4	Q What is your reaction to the level of
L5	those fee requests?
L6	A Music is one element of what we at NPR and
L7	what Public Radio provides. It's an important
L8	element. But it's part of a larger mix. And there
L9	has been no material change in our use of music over
20	the past five years. In fact, and I can speak
21	specifically for NPR and the Public Radio industry
22	there has been a great deal of format shifting.

Indeed, formats in Public Radio 1 2 shifting away from musical formats towards more news 3 talk. A number of stations have changed their format in the past few years. 4 5 At the same time, our -- the budgets for 6 program expenditures have been basically very flat, if 7 not reduced, in some cases. So in general, 8 frankly, was astonished by the request from the And I think that 9 Societies. any call 10 substantial increase is ludicrous. 0 What is the overall mission of Public 11 12 Radio, Mr. Jablow? 13 Α To provide programming which educates and informs, culturally enriches the general public; quite 14 15 frankly, to create a more informed public. That is 16 our mission. And we do that in partnership with our 17 member stations. 18 JUDGE DREYFUS: Excuse me for 19 interrupting. One second, counsel. I cannot find the 20 year in your direct testimony when you joined NPR. 21 And I was waiting for you to say it, and you never 22 said it.

So I'm sorry. What was that year?
THE WITNESS: It was 1995.
JUDGE DREYFUS: Okay. Thank you.
BY MR. RICH:
Q Are you familiar with the concept called
"universality of service"?
A Absolutely.
Q Does that have applicability to Public
Radio?
A Very much so. We are mandated by Congress
to provide as universal a service as possible.
Indeed, Public Radio reaches approximately 97 percent
of the American public and is in some areas of this
country, specifically some significantly rural areas,
the only form of communication.
Q In fulfilling the mission you describe,
how, if at all, is the programming of Public Radio
similar to or different than that of its commercial
counterparts?
A It's significantly different.
ic b bightiteancity difference.
Q How so?

long, tell me. We don't produce any program because it's commercially viable. We produce programming because we think it's in the best interest of the American public, because it's something we feel is needed and what we want to do.

And I'm going to break it down by format now if that's all right. Our news magazines, Morning Edition and All Things Considered, are not done in a format that would be in the least commercially viable. It's what's called long form news.

We will talk and sometimes have heard people talking too long on subjects to provide in-depth, detailed coverage and analysis. We will cover subjects in our news magazines and on our air that make the public in some cases very uncomfortable. These are not subjects that are necessarily those that people wouldn't want to hear on radio, but once we engage them, they stay with us and listen.

We've done a series recently on death and dying in America. For 52 weeks, we're going to be running bits and pieces about how people deal with death and dying and grief.

We are starting a series in May called 1 Beyond Affliction: The Disability History Project; 2 3 again, not a light, humorous subject but a subject 4 that we feel is important and will clearly provide a 5 service to the American public. 6 On the music side of the ledger, we don't 7 produce music because it makes money for us. In fact, 8 it doesn't at all. It's not wallpaper. We ask people 9 to invest in their listening. We don't ask them just 10 to listen. They have to invest their time. 11 We provide music to the American public 12 because it's culturally enriching. It's our mandate. 13 We, in fact, do a great deal of programming that you will find nowhere else on the radio dial. 14 15 We do a form of jazz that you will not find on a commercial station. We do Celtic music. 16 17 We'll do a wide variety of music that it would be hard 18 to attach a dollar value to it, but it's something 19 that's important and appeals to a certain niche. 20 Let's talk a little bit about

function in the Public Broadcasting system.

functions does NPR perform?

21

1 Α We are very different from our close 2 We produce, acquire, and distribute friends at PBS. 3 programming for the Public Radio system. The majority 4 of what we have -- the majority of what we do and what 5 we have developed a reputation for is the programming that we produce. About 65 percent of our programming 6 7 talk-based. About is news 35 percent is cultural-based. 8 9 Our programming is what we call --

really the guts of the Public Radio system. Our news magazines, Morning Edition and All Things Considered, are there at drive time and are -- even though both programs are two hours in length, in many markets, you will find them rolled over so that they're on for six hours in some major markets around this country. That is the guts and the core of the Public Radio system.

And I guess one example of that is the fact that though our programming represents approximately 25 percent of the Public Radio program schedule, it represents a little more than 50 percent of the listening.

Q By "Public Radio schedule," you mean hours

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

1	of actual broadcast time?
2	A That's correct. That's correct.
3	Q By 50 percent of the listenership?
4	A That is correct.
5	Q Measured how?
6	A Time spent listening.
7	MR. SCHAEFFER: Is that in the direct?
8	THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. The we are
9	also a membership organization. We have approximately
10	600 members, but that is not all of the CPB-funded
11	Public Radio stations. There are about approximately
12	100 more Public Radio stations. I think there are
13	almost 700 Public Radio stations.
14	BY MR. RICH:
15	Q Can you tell me a little about the
16	composition of NPR's member stations?
17	A They range from stations in major markets
18	that are fairly substantial in size to the smallest,
19	tiniest Ma and Pa shop in a rural area. They are
20	spread all over the country and have represent all
21	levels of sophistication.
22	And they also represent a variety of

1	formats of programming, from classical to classical
2	news to news talk to jazz to AAA, which is another
3	format which refers to adult acoustic contemporary
4	music.
5	It's a great diversity. I think it's very
6	reflective of the American public, which we serve.
7	Q You mentioned there are, did you say,
8	about 100 stations which are noncommercial educational
9	Public Radio stations which are not NPR members?
10	A That's correct.
11	Q Do you have an understanding whether those
12	entities are as well-represented in the instant
13	proceeding?
14	A I believe they are.
L5	Q And if you would take a quick look at PB
L6	Exhibit 1, please, in the booklet that's in front of
17	you? I would ask you if you're able to confirm that
18	the listing beginning midway through, which is labeled
19	"CPB-Qualified Public Radio Grantees and Stations"
20	reflects as of the commencement of this proceeding a
21	list of all CPB-qualified radio stations, to the best
ł	

22

of your knowledge.

1	A To the best of my knowledge, it does.
2	Q Now, of these 600 or so NPR member
3	stations, Mr. Jablow, are they all fully functioning
4	stations in the manner in which we think of radio
5	stations?
6	A No.
7	MR. SCHAEFFER: Is this in the direct, Mr.
8	Rich?
9	MR. RICH: If I may, I guess I'm a little
10	puzzled. Early on in the ASCAP and BMI case, I think
11	we only did and Mr. Schaeffer even indeed said that
12	minor deviations from literal text wouldn't be the
13	subject of anything unless a major study was put in.
14	I'm simply augmenting by a factor that is
15	so noncontroversial. You know, I don't know what else
16	to say.
17	MR. SCHAEFFER: It's pretty controversial,
18	Mr. Rich, because we didn't have the opportunity to
19	take discovery of the contentions you're now going to
20	make as to what the relative size was of the stations
21	that NPR is representing here.
22	And it is more than a slight diversion

because I have no doubt if I could have asked for 1 discovery based on that, I could have shown that many 2 3 of the stations we're talking about are very, very 4 large and competitive, as Mr. Unmacht said. 5 So I do object, and I do regard this as a significant diversion. But it's not at all anywhere 6 7 in the direct. And it's, in effect, a mousetrap, I 8 think, what they're putting in now. 9 MR. RICH: I'm doing nothing about station 10 size or economic wherewithal. I'm simply attempting 11 to elicit, if you were to allow the witness to answer, 12 the fact that there is a rather significant component of these total stations which have a rather passive 13 role in the system at some point in the question and 14 15 the answer. I really do find trouble with -- because 16 17 I moderated greatly my objections during the ASCAP and 18 BMI presentations on the explicit representations of Mr. Schaeffer and Mr. Kleinberg that nobody was going 19 20 to be literal in this proceeding in holding their

Mr. Boyle went off on any number of

witnesses to direct lines.

21

1	tangents. And I hold my tongue on the expectation of
2	some modest degree of reciprocity.
3	MR. SCHAEFFER: I have been reciprocal in
4	many of these questions you asked other witnesses. I
5	don't think you should debate this. The point is it's
6	not in the direct, and this could have been the
7	subject of discovery as an important area, namely how
8	these stations functioned.
9	Now for the first time I'm being faced
LO	with questions on that subject.
L1	JUDGE GULIN: It's a material
L2	supplementation of the
L3	MR. SCHAEFFER: I regard it as a material
L4	issue.
L5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Mr. Kleinberg, do
L6	you have a position, sir, on this?
L7	MR. KLEINBERG: I don't have a position.
L8	MR. SCHAEFFER: There's not even a call
L9	letter.
20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: The objection is
21	overruled.
22	MR. RICH: Thank you.

1	BY MR. RICH:
2	Q Can you respond to whether there is some
3	segment of the station population, namely the member
4	station population, that functions in less than a
5	fully sort of operating sense?
6	A Yes. The 600-member station, a number of
7	members of NPR, is a little bit misleading. Yes,
8	there are 600 members, but of that 600, approximately
9	half are what we call full members, those which have
LO	staff, our licensees, and fully operate a radio
L1	station.
L2	The other 300 are what we refer to as
L3	repeaters or translators, which is stations that
L4	operate in repeaters, they're on the same frequency
L5	as the broadcast station repeating that original
L6	signal.
L7	And other stations might be on a different
L8	signal, but they are also repeating the original
L9	signal of the parent station. And those are what we
20	call translators.
21	MR. SCHAEFFER: I renew my objection.
22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Do vou have more

	quescions in this area:
2	MR. RICH: I'm finished with my questions
3	in this area.
4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Okay. We've ruled
5	on that, and the testimony will stand on that issue.
6	Go ahead to your next question.
7	MR. SCHAEFFER: Can I be at least allowed
8	some discovery on this subject, which is new to us?
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Well, let's wait
10	until you've had the opportunity to cross-examine, Mr.
11	Schaeffer.
12	MR. SCHAEFFER: I'm reluctant to
13	cross-examine in an area that I don't know what I'm
1.4	getting into. And without discovery, now I really
15	have been mousetrapped.
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Well, let me just
L7	inquire about one thing of the witness. In your
18	direct testimony on Page 4, you refer to 691 Public
19	Radio stations supported with CPB funding, of which
20	594 are members of NPR.
21	Is that you're trying to tell us now that
22	over half of these are not these figures excuse
	1

1	me; let's go back onto Page 4 are accurate. Is
2	that correct?
3	THE WITNESS: That is correct, yes.
4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: And you're
5	indicating now that only half of those are what you
6	would call full members?
7	THE WITNESS: They're full dues-paying
8	members. The other stations might be affiliates of
9	theirs, which are simply rebroadcasting the majority
10	of what the full member is broadcasting.
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: But they belong to
12	your organization?
13	THE WITNESS: Correct. They belong to us
14	as affiliates as well.
15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: And they pay
16	membership dues and so forth?
17	THE WITNESS: A distinctly lower amount.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Okay.
19	JUDGE GULIN: I'm not sure what's before
20	us right now. A request for discovery?
21	MR. SCHAEFFER: Well, I don't know. I
22	don't know how to handle this in the context of this

1	hearing. Suddenly I've been surprised with a new fact
2	which I believe if I had been allowed a little
3	discovery, I could show that this formatting suddenly
4	is something new. And I can't cross-examine because,
5	in effect, who knows what thicket I'm going to be
6	getting into.
7	I thought that was the purpose of the rule
8	so that I would know what the issues were and I could
9	take discovery about it before I came to this hearing.
10	Now I can't.
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. Mr.
12	Rich?
13	MR. RICH: This is not about formatting.
14	This is a simple fact to put in context a number. All
15	of the financial data related to Public Radio as ASCAP
16	has felt relevant have been presented in its direct
17	case.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Why wasn't it
19	included in the direct testimony?
20	MR. RICH: Your Honor, I can only give you
21	the most honest answer, which is as one sits, as I'm
22	sure happens with my colleagues and scopes out a

direct, the gentleman says to you "Well, I think it 1 2 should be pointed out the following." I said, "Look, 3 that would be useful to point out to the Panel." 4 With all respect to Mr. Schaeffer, this is 5 not central to anybody's case. JUDGE DREYFUS: How do you see the impact 6 7 of that on the question before us? What's the impact 8 on rates, for example, of this information? 9 MR. RICH: It has no direct bearing on our 10 case in terms of the economic model we proffer. Nor, to my knowledge, does it on the models that ASCAP or 11 12 BMI proffers. Again, I think putting a frame on what the dynamics of the industry are so that when one 13 14 hears a number of 600 stations, one recognizes, as I 15 have now learned, that there is some subset of stations which functions on a more limited basis in 16 17 terms of original programming initiatives. I thought a useful fact of --18 19 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: And you do not 20 intend to argue that this will affect our decision in 21 any way in determining the rate which we ultimately 22 determine --

	MR. RICH: Based on my present knowledge
2	of the ASCAP and BMI case, no, sir.
3	MR. SCHAEFFER: I made the argument and
4	it was a fairly important argument that the ability
5	to pay was relevant. You may recall we submitted a
6	chart that showed what the cost would be to each radio
7	station and each television station of the ability to
8	pay.
9	Now, I also made another suggestion. I
10	said we might key it to the ability to revenues and
11	that that might be a fairer way to do it and it would
12	be okay with me and maybe that is another way.
13	But that whole subject now is really open
14	because I really don't know what I'm going to do to
15	buttress that argument since I have no longer any
16	right of discovery. And I would have had the right if
17	they had put this in the original direct testimony.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Right. Let me just
19	confer about one thing.
20	(Whereupon, the Panel conferred off the
21	record.)
22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: It's the opinion of

1	the Panel at this time that what has been elicited
2	and we understand that this is the last of what you're
3	going to discuss in this area is not a material
4	deviation from the direct testimony. Therefore, the
5	objection is overruled.
6	MR. RICH: Thank you, Your Honor.
7	BY MR. RICH:
8	Q Mr. Jablow, you mentioned several of NPR's
9	leading news and information programs, I believe,
LO	Morning Edition and All Things Considered?
L1	A Uh-huh.
L2	Q On the culture side of the programming
L3	ledger, what would you identify as some of the more
L4.	significant NPR programming initiatives?
.5	A NPR programs or
.6	Q Let's just do NPR for the moment.
-7	A NPR? The programs that we produce
8	include: Performance Today, which is a daily
L9	classical show; Jazz Profiles, which is a completely
20	jazz show. There are a number those are primarily
21	the ones we produce. There are a number that we
22	acquire.

1	The best known program, which is
2	classified as a cultural program, is Car Talk, which,
3	frankly, is far from cultural, but that's where we put
4	it.
5	Q Can you describe the general content of
6	Car Talk?
7	A It's very difficult. It is two extremely
8	well-educated Bostonian Ph.D.'s from M.I.T. parsing
9	out automobile advice to the public that calls, but
10	it's, quite frankly, much more the metaphor for advice
11	on living and life in America.
12	Q Were there others you wanted to identify?
13	A A Prairie Home Companion is a well-known
14	cultural show that is distributed by Public Radio
15	International. It's appropriate here that NPR is the
16	largest producer, acquirer, and distributor of
17	programming in the Public Radio system, but there are
18	others.
19	Public Radio International is one.
20	Independent producers can distribute programs
21	themselves. And stations that produce programs can
22	distribute them themselves as well.

T	There are a number of other one of the
2	best known our Celtic show that we put on is called
3	the Thistle and Shamrock. Jazz Piano With Marion
4	McPartland is another well-known show.
5	Another there are a bunch of news and
6	information shows that I haven't mentioned, but the
7	Diane Rehm Show, Fresh Air. They make up, again, the
8	substance of the Public Radio system, national program
9	delivery.
LO	Q With reference to your written testimony
11	at Page 7, can you tell the Panel, please, what has
12	been happening to Public Radio's programming mix over
L3	the past decade?
14	MR. KLEINBERG: Could I just it's not
15	an objection but just an inquiry so the record is
L6	clear. Bruce, when you say "Public Radio," are you
L7	talking about NPR or
18	MR. RICH: I was going to attempt to
19	clarify that right now with the witness.
20	MR. KLEINBERG: Okay. Because it's
21	getting a little
22	MR. RICH: Yes.

Т	BY MR. RICH:
2	Q For purposes of this question, Mr. Jablow,
3	I'm asking you not merely to focus on NPR-generated or
4	distributed programming but programming system-wide.
5	First question: Do you understand the chart appearing
6	at Page 7 to be depicting system-wide program mix
7	data?
8	A Yes, I do.
9	Q Okay.
10	MR. SCHAEFFER: Now I'm confused. Were we
11	talking before this just about NPR, as opposed to
12	Public Radio stations?
13	MR. RICH: We were talking about what the
14	witness was talking about. At times he said these
15	were NPR-produced programs, at times they were
16	NPR-distributed programs.
17	MR. SCHAEFFER: Okay.
18	BY MR. RICH:
19	Q Do you have the question in mind, Mr.
20	Jablow?
21	A Yes. I believe the question was: What
22	does this chart on Page 7 reflect
	i de la companya del companya de la companya del companya de la co

Τ	Q Yes.
2	A over the course of time?
3	Q In terms of system-wide trends.
4	A In general, to do a fairly quick capsule
5	summary, what the chart shows if you look at the
6	column that says "Total Music Base," which is the
7	fifth column from the right, is the use of music in
8	the Public Radio system has generally declined from 70
9	percent in the Spring of 1987 to approximately 65
10	percent in the Spring of 1996.
11	At the same time, in the column right next
12	to it, to its right, the news and information program,
13	the use of news and information programs, throughout
14	the Public Radio system has increased from
15	approximately 22 percent of a programs's schedule to
16	29 percent.
17	Q And if you were to examine the first six
18	column entries, which let me ask you a preliminary
19	question. Is it your understanding that the column
20	denominated "Total Music Base" reflects the sum of the
21	percentages in the six columns preceding it, to its
22	left?

	A Yes. Yes, it does.
2	Q And examining those six columns, have you
3	observed any trends over time?
4	A Well, some modest trends, yes. The use of
5	classical music has slightly declined. The use of
6	jazz music has slightly declined as well as folk,
7	which is a small percentage but has slightly declined.
8	World music for 1987 shows a slight
9	increase. And pop music has pretty much been
10	relatively constant with eclectic music, as I referred
11	to earlier, having declined.
12	Q How would we go about determining the
13	combination of programming which is format-wise one or
14	the other of news and information or classical music?
15	Would that entail totaling up Columns 1 and 7?
16	A I'm sorry. I lost your question.
17	Q How would one go about determining the
18	total percentage of Public Radio programming, which
19	consists of one of either of two formats: classical
20	music or news and information?
21	A Right. It would be one, Column 1, and/or
22	7. They would represent 1 being classical music,
- 1	1

1.	Column 7 talking about news and information.
2	Q Well, can you tell us a little bit about
3	how the chart at Page 7 was prepared?
4	A Yes. We do with support from the
5	Corporation for Public Broadcasting an annual carriage
6	survey. This has been done well, I certainly know
7	it's been done 1986. I don't know how much prior to
8	that it was done.
9	Basically this entails us communicating to
10	each of the stations in the Public Radio system, not
11	just the NPR members, and getting each of the stations
12	to fill out a 24-hour, 7-day-a-week program grid,
13	which identifies each of the programs that they
14	broadcast during each hour, half-hour of the day.
15	Then that information is retrieved and
16	basically tabulated by us as part of the carriage
17	report. This information is extremely important to
18	the Public Radio system because subsequently it is
19	distributed by us to the Radio Research Consortium, to
20	other analytic enterprises that provide information
21	back to the system.
	l i

So it's the first cog in a significant

1	wheel of information.
2	Q If you would turn to Tab 17 of the
3	collection of Public Broadcasting exhibits? Can you
4	identity the documents there contained and their
5	relationship to the chart on Page 7?
6	A Yeah. These are summary documents that
7	provide by format. And these are done on an
8	annualized basis, produced by NPR and CPB. Summary
9	documents for providing information on the amount of
10	classical jazz or format programming that goes on in
11	the Public Radio system.
12	Q How reliable do you consider the
13	information depicted in Chart 7 gathered by the
14	process you described?
15	A I think it's very reliable because it is
16	in the mutual best interests of the stations and NPR
17	that the information be accurate. And it is checked
18	and double checked.
19	Q At Page 9 of your testimony, sir, in the
20	first full paragraph, you indicate, "Notably, while
21	news and information programming accounts for just
22	under 30 percent of Public Radio's broadcasting hours,

1	it commands about 50 percent of actual listener
2	hours."
3	Do you see that?
4	A Uh-huh.
5	Q How do those data relate to your previous
6	testimony offered to the Panel today about the trends
7	and tendencies as you see them in terms of program mix
8	over time in Public Radio?
9	A Well, news and information is the core
10	competency of National Public Radio. It's what we do
11	
L2	MR. KLEINBERG: I'm sorry? You dropped
L3	your voice.
1.4	THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. News and
1.5	information is the core competency of National Public
1.6	Radio. It is what we do well. It is what the
17	stations have an immense amount of faith and trust in
18	our judgment and our expertise. It is what the
19	audience seems to not only like but be keenly
20	interested in.
21	The trend these past five years has been
22	towards more news and information programming. And I

1	would venture to guess that you'll see even a more
2	significant trend over the next five years in that
3	respect.
4	BY MR. RICH:
5	Q Turning to your testimony at Pages 11 and
6	12, with respect to programming expenditures, what has
7	been the trend, again system-wide, in Public Radio,
8	not limited to NPR over the past five years?
9	A System-wide it's been relatively flat. As
10	I said here, it's increased by only 6 percent, from
11	152 million to approximately 162 million, during that
12	span in time.
13	Q And if you would turn to PB Exhibit 6,
14	please? There are set forth there certain unadjusted
15	programming and production expenditures figures. Do
16	you see those?
17	A Yes, I do.
18	Q I don't know if you were in the room
19	yesterday I think when Judge Griffith asked the
20	question about the down slope in the 1996 entry for
21	radio of \$161.8 million. Can you explain what
22	apparently accounts for that?

1	A I will try. And yes, I was here to see
2	Judge Griffith's response to that. The dip between
3	1995 and 1996, I think there is a this isn't an
4	accurate reflection of more appropriately more
5	constancy perhaps. It is my understanding that these
6	numbers reflect between those two years the FASB
7	changes in reporting requirements.
8	The expenses for programming stations
9	when reporting the expenses to the Corporation for
10	Public Broadcasting backed out in kind services
11	relating to program expenditures, which in Public
12	Radio are a fairly significant number.
13	I don't know what the adjusted numbers
14	ultimately look like, but I think the unadjusted
15	numbers between 1995 and 1996 don't necessarily give
16	you the most accurate portrayal.
17	Q Who, to your knowledge, performed the
18	adjustments on which public broadcasters rely in this
19	proceeding? Your understanding as to who performed
20	these adjustments?
21	A When these numbers were developed? I

believe the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

1	Q I'm not being clear with my question. For
2	purposes of taking these unadjusted numbers and
3	presenting them in this proceeding on an adjusted
4	basis, you didn't perform that, I take it?
5	A That is correct. I didn't.
6	Q Do you know who did?
7	A I believe Mr. Jaffe did.
8	Q And so he would be the expert on how one
9	gets from the numbers presented in PB 6 to the numbers
10	reflected in your written testimony?
11	A Correct, correct.
12	Q And you rely on those adjusted numbers and
13	on his work in that regard?
14	A Yes, absolutely.
L5	Q Now, focusing on NPR itself, as opposed to
16	system-wide, what has happened to NPR's own
L7	programming expenditures over the past five-year
18	period? That's again reference to your testimony at
19	Pages 11 and 12.
20	A Yes. NPR's program expenditures for news
21	and information have grown. We've invested a great
22	deal of time and effort to expanding our new service.

1	And let me allude, if I may, to a few of the things we
2	have done.
3	We have expanded All Things Considered
4	from an hour and a half show to a two-hour program now
5	beginning at 4:00 p.m. on the East Coast. We took
6	Morning Edition and moved it to 6:00 a.m. We
7	established 24-hour newscasts. We invested in Talk of
8	the Nation, a daily two-hour news talk show.
9	So we made some significant expenditures
10	in news and information at the same time that the
11	monies that we have spent in cultural programming have
12	stayed materially the same or shown a slight
13	reduction.
14	Q And I would ask you to turn to PB Exhibit
15	19, please. And with reference to your testimony in
16	that exhibit, can you tell me the source of the
17	information relating to NPR's program expenditures?
18	A On Page 3 of the this is an audited
19	statement produced by Deloitte and Touche, our
20	auditor, and
21	Q And the numbers derived from these
22	documents?

1	A The numbers derived yeah, yes. Where
2	do they come from? They come from our annual program
3	expenditures.
4	MR. RICH: I have no further questions.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right.
6	JUDGE GULIN: A couple of questions. I
7	guess your conclusions that the existing music license
8	rate should not be increased are based upon the fact
9	that music use has been flat or declining and that
10	programming expenditures have been essentially flat.
11	Is that correct?
12	THE WITNESS: Yes.
13	JUDGE GULIN: Do you know what the rates
14	are now that are paid?
15	THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.
16	JUDGE GULIN: And it's what? Is it 3.775
17	million per year by CPB? Does that sound right?
18	THE WITNESS: I know the total over the
19	past five years, which I could divide by five if that
20	would help, but that is approximately, right.
21	JUDGE GULIN: And that's paid. So NPR
22	doesn't pay anything, but, actually, CPB pays the

1	fees?
2	THE WITNESS: Well, it's a little bit more
3	convoluted than that, but
4	JUDGE GULIN: Okay. That's what I was
5	going to ask you about. Tell me about it.
6	THE WITNESS: Okay. It is my
7	understanding that the monies that are allocated
8	first of all, CPB is mandated by Congress for the
9	expense on music royalties.
10	The monies, I believe that a certain
11	percentage of what they are granted by Congress is to
12	go towards the payment off the top to music royalties.
13	My understanding is that the payment the
14	that money is put into an escrow account, which is
15	controlled jointly by the Public Broadcasting Service
16	and NPR. And the monies flow out of that escrow
17	account to the music royalty societies.
18	JUDGE GULIN: Do you know what part of
19	those funds are allocated for NPR?
20	THE WITNESS: I do not.
21	JUDGE GULIN: Is there such an allocation?
22	Are you aware that there is such an allocation?

1	THE WITNESS: I am not aware that there is
2	such an allocation.
3	JUDGE GULIN: Thank you.
4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. Mr.
5	Schaeffer?
6	CROSS-EXAMINATION
7	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
8	Q Let me just preliminary before I get at
9	some of it, are you aware of any limit that Congress
LO	has put on the payment overall of music royalties'
11	performing rights organizations; that is that is there
12	anything that says that the Public Broadcasting
13	stations themselves don't have to pay or need not pay?
L4	A I'm not aware of that.
15	Q You had mentioned FASB, F-A-S-B. What is
16	that?
L7	A Financial Accounting Standards Board.
1.8	Q Now, you have said that there was a change
19	in 1995 or '96. I wasn't quite clear. What was that
20	change that you were referring to?
21	A It's actually a very complicated change
22	for the nonprofit industry. It reflects
1	

1	Q Well, tell me what
2	A Well, I'll give you my layman's
3	interpretation
4	Q Yes because it's new to me.
5	A That reflects in the way monies are
6	reported according to Generally Accepted Accounting
7	Principles. One example I can give you is that on the
8	revenue side, monies that are donated by a foundation
9	spread over a period of time let's say the Ford
LO	Foundation gives NPR a five-year grant.
L1	Q Right.
12	A Those monies, rather than being spread as
L3	they are spent over those five years, are all
L4	reflected in the first year when they are received.
L5	Q I see. And that's a difference as from
L6	what it was formally?
L7	A That is correct.
L8	Q So that would equally be true of a
L9	not-for-profit, such as the Public Broadcasting
20	Service. Isn't that true?
21	A In terms of them being affected
22	Q Yes.

1	\mathbb{A} by FASB regulations? Yes, that's true.
2	Q All of it? So that it would mean that the
3	1996 financial reports of PBS, NPR, the Corporation
4	for Public Broadcasting would also have to reflect
5	this accounting change, namely there might be for the
6	first time a bunching up in the previous years when
7	the payments were received, as opposed to the
8	amortized income over a period of time. Is that
9	correct?
10	A Well, I cannot speak for the other
11	organizations.
12	Q But that's
13	A But I'm saying that the FASB change did
14	affect accounting practices.
15	Q So that in reading the financial statement
16	that Mr. Rich alluded in the 1995-1996 statement in
17	Exhibit 4 and in the financial reports of the
18	respective public broadcasters, we have to consider
19	these FASB changes in order to apply apples to apples,
20	as opposed to apples and oranges. Would that be your
21	businessman's opinion?
22	A Yes.

1	Q Thank you.
2	MR. SCHAEFFER: Now let me ask you another
3	question before we get to I mean, obviously it's
4	not within his province.
5	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
6	Q Do you have an idea of how many
7	approximately broadcasting hours over Public Radio
8	there are in, say, 1997 or 1996?
9	A Not off the top of my head.
LO	Q Whatever that amount of broadcasting hours
L1	by public stations and let's confine ourselves to
L2	the public stations, the public radio stations,
L3	represented by NPR in this proceeding. Okay?
4	A Uh-huh.
L5	Q If you'd fix that in our what
6	proportion of those broadcasting hours carry
L7	NPR-produced or distributed programs?
L8	A Approximately 25 percent of the broadcast
L9	hours.
20	Q So it's far less than the majority?
21	A Certainly.
22	Q And the other 75 percent and I'm not

1	nording you to a specific percent because I know it
2	would be very difficult. But based on your expertise,
3	what proportion would be other vendors or would be
4	locally produced programs or the like?
5	A I think approximately just over 50 percent
6	would be locally produced program. And the rest would
7	be representative of NPR, PRI, or other national
8	distributors.
9	Q Now, in a number of I'll withdraw that.
10	In answering a number of Mr. Rich's
11	questions, you used the word "We" provide this kind of
12	diverse programming and you refer to certain
13	individual programs. Were you referring in those
14	cases to those programs which were produced by NPR or
15	all of the Public Radio stations?
16	A I was not in my references referring just
17	to NPR programming.
18	Q Well, for example, when you said "We do
19	Jazz Profiles, and we do All Things Considered," in
20	those cases you were referring to NPR, were you not?
21	A Yes, I was.
22	Q So that sometimes in your testimony

1	before, when you used the word "we," you were
2	referring to yourself as representative of all the
3	stations, the entire Public Radio industry, and in
4	some cases you were referring to NPR; right?
5	A Perhaps, yes.
6	Q All right. I'm going to show you
7	MR. SCHAEFFER: Would you put before the
8	witness ASCAP Exhibit 302? It's already in evidence.
9	It's called "Future How." You already have a copy of
10	it. Just to make everybody's life easier, we
11	reproduced it. I'm sure everybody does.
12	We may do it in rebuttal anyway. We may
13	do it in rebuttal anyway. Oh, okay. Let me do this.
14	Remind me because I'm getting all of this advice.
15	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
16	Q Would you turn to Page 6 of the document?
17	It's been previously established and I'm sure you'll
18	confirm this is nothing more than the Corporation for
19	Public Broadcasting 1996 annual report. Have you read
20	it before or seen it?
21	A No, I have not read it, nor have I seen
22	it, actually.
- 1	

1	Q All right. I'm going to ask you whether
2	in your opinion the following statements are accurate
3	in the report based upon your current you have been
4	now how many years in the Public Broadcasting
5	industry?
6	A Three years.
7	Q Incidentally, when you came to Public
8	Broadcasting, did that in any way signal a change in
9	the way NPR was going to be administered in the
10	future? Were you part of the policy change when you
11	came on board?
12	A I would be giving myself far more credit
13	than I deserve.
14	Q Well, maybe so. And I'm sure you deserve
15	a great deal of credit because you have a very
16	difficult job and NPR is a very, very fine service and
17	Public Broadcasting is an excellent industry.
18	But was it your understanding that you
19	were brought on board to make some changes in the way
20	the business was run?
21	A I was brought on board by Delano Lewis,
22	who is the CEO of NPR, to try to operate the company

1	more efficiently and better than it had before.
2	Q Was there an understanding that by the
3	way, who did you replace?
4	A There was no Chief Operating Officer
5	previously.
6	Q So it's a new position?
7	A It was sort of a combination of a few
8	positions.
9	Q And was the understanding when you came on
10	board that NPR would be a little more businesslike
11	than it had been before?
12	A That was I think one of the many
13	understandings that I had. We were going to change a
14	little bit of the nature of how we operated.
15	Q Tell us about what those changes were
16	going to be. And don't spare yourself because I think
17	everybody in this room, including the PROs, have
18	nothing but admiration for NPR, PBS, no matter what it
19	sounded like in this forum and publicly. There's so
20	much admiration that we think you can easily pay the
21	prices we're asking.
22	A Then your admiration is definitely

1 misplaced. 2 (Laughter.) 3 THE WITNESS: The NPR -- and I will use a 4 few sort of misplaced metaphors here. NPR nearly went 5 bankrupt in 1983 because it was terribly mismanaged. Even though it has envisionary leadership, it wasn't 6 7 very good at managing the shop. 8 In 1983 new leadership came in with a 9 mandate of getting the house in order. And by getting 10 the house in order, NPR became an extremely efficient that, frankly, operated much 11 operation 12 government agency. 13 The metaphor I use is that NPR was a ship full of a variety of holes that the new leadership was 14 15 told to patch, fill, lay out, and anchor and make sure 16 that you created a stable environment for Public 17 Radio, which indeed they very effectively did for 18 approximately ten years. What they did not do was to ever pick up the anchor and chart, move a little bit 19 forward. 20 So to a large extent, NPR was functioning 21 22 like a government agency, very happy with what it was

1	doing. And it needed to look at new technologies,
2	look at other things that it might be doing as service
3	to the American public in charting its new direction.
4	And that's really what Del Lewis as the
5	new CEO was charged with doing.
6	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
7	Q And you, too, I take it when you came on
8	as COO?
9	A I was brought in by Mr. Lewis.
10	Q By the way, just if you know, in, say,
11	1983, what proportion, if you know or have an
12	understanding, of Public Broadcasting hours were NPR
13	productions or distributions?
14	A I do not know.
15	Q Do you know if it changed downward or
16	upward since that time?
17	A That would be very hard for me to
18	speculate on.
19	Q Well, let's go to when for the first time
20	could you give us your understanding of what the
21	relative proportions are?
22	A Really, the last ten-year period.

T	Q Ten years ago, what was the proportion?
2	A The proportion NPR's programming has
3	always increased significantly. Let's see. When
4	Morning Edition was added, which was 1983 it was
5	the year it almost went bankrupt. So at that point in
6	time, there was a major distinction in the amount of
7	programming provided by NPR.
8	Since that point in time, it's been
9	relatively constant with the addition of other
LO	programs that such as Car Talk, which have made a
L1	significant dent and the add-on of significant weekend
L2	news magazines: Weekend Edition Saturday, Weekend
L3	Edition Sunday. So it is slightly increased, but
L4	Q So it is pretty well level at 25 percent,
L5	would you say?
L6	A I think it's relatively accurate.
۱7	Q And just so again because I'm a little
.8	Car Talk is produced by NPR or acquired?
L9	A It's acquired and distributed by NPR.
20	Q And the stations pay for Car Talk?
21	A Certainly.
22	Q Who do they pay?

1	A NPR.
2	Q Now, are there other stations like Prairie
3	Home Companion which are produced by other providers
4	of programming?
5	A Shows like Prairie Home Companion?
6	Q Yes.
7	A Yes.
8	Q And Prairie Home Companion is PRI, you
9	say?
10	A Distributed by Public Radio International.
11	Q Who pays? PRI gets paid separately by the
12	stations for that service or that program?
13	A That is correct.
L4	Q And I assume there are a whole bunch of
L5	providers out there to the stations like PRI a
L6	"whole bunch." There is more than one provider to the
L7	stations other than PRI and NPR?
18	A Yes. NPR and PRI are the two largest
19	national distributors. Stations can distribute their
20	own produced programs. Independent producers can
21	distribute programs as well.
22	Q And just so I get the picture before we go

1	into what I'm going to ask you in a minute, I know
2	that from my own learning, there are very music
3	services and there are jazz services that sometimes
4	you hear on radio, classical music, popular music.
5	Are in any of those cases those also
6	producers outside of NPR or PRI who then sell those
7	services as sort of a package to the stations?
8	MR. RICH: Object to the form.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: I didn't hear what
10	the objection was.
11	MR. RICH: That there was a factual
12	predicate. He said, "I know there are."
13	MR. SCHAEFFER: Oh, I'll
14	MR. RICH: There's no foundation to
15	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
16	Q Isn't it a fact that there are a number of
17	producers who sell packages of music to Public Radio
18	stations for broadcasting by them?
19	A You used the term "a number." I'm not
20	aware of a number of producers. I think there are a
21	limited few. And I think the majority of what is
22	distributed to Public Radio stations are programs, not

1	services.
2	Q Well, isn't there sort of something called
3	Beethoven?
4	A Uh-huh.
5	Q What is that?
6	A It's called a Beethoven what is it
7	called? That is a service I believe that is a
8	service provided by a commercial station out of
9	Chicago. It is primarily an overnight service that
10	Public Radio stations can purchase if they so choose.
11	Q And it has a different sort of a number of
12	musical pieces that then are rebroadcast? How does
13	that work?
14	A I believe it's a stream of classical
15	programming that is developed by that service.
16	Q Is there also something like that for some
17	jazz music?
18	A I truly don't know. I know there are two
19	stations that are known for their jazz music. And I
20	don't know if they're providing the streams that they
21	have developed to the system.
22	Q Did you ever hear of Classical 24th?

1	A Oh, yes.
2	Q Is that another one of these kinds of
3	services?
4	A That comes out of Minnesota Public Radio.
5	Q I see. All right. Well, let's move on to
6	what I was going to ask you before. Would you look at
7	page I think we were looking at Page 6. And this
8	is from the CPB. And I would solicit your views as to
9	whether or not you agree based on your experience in
10	the last three years. This was written in 1996 or at
11	least for the report in '96, must have been '97.
12	"Over the next five years, Public Radio
13	must strengthen its audience service and be more
L4	accountable to its listeners. Audience service needs
1.5	to improve because Public Radio's community financial
L6	support must increase faster over the next few years
L7	than it has over the past five years.
18	"Today Public Radio consists of several
19	hundred local licensees that provide quality
20	programming and services to 92 percent of the U.S.
21	population. Its weekly audience is growing, 35
22	percent since 1990, and now includes 19 million

1	listeners. System financial growth over the past 5
2	years has been driven by listener support, up more
3	than 40 percent, and by underwriting, up by more than
4	two-thirds."
5	Would you agree with that?
6	A Would I agree with what?
7	Q With what CPB is there stating in its
8	annual report of 1996. Does that sound right to you?
9	A I would agree with the following. The
10	public because I have a sense of where this came
11	from having been involved with the future fund. The
12	Public Radio system has been challenged by the federal
13	government to create ancillary streams of support
14	based upon the likely possibility that federal funding
15	will diminish or disappear over the course of a number
16	of years.
17	So yes, I would agree that it is in the
18	interest of Public Radio stations everywhere to
19	strengthen their listener base, to increase listener,
20	and to increase listener-sensitive income.
21	Q And, as far as you know, are the numbers
22	that CPB here reports accurate? Do you have any

1	reason to dispute them, namely 90 percent, 92 percent
2	of the population is served, that the audience is
3	growing, 35 percent since 1990, et cetera?
4	A I actually think that we're serving more
5	than 92 percent, but I don't have any way of
6	validating the 35 percent growth.
7	Q You had made reference and this page also
8	refers to something called the radio future fund. And
9	I'll leave it to the well, let me know if you agree
10	with this, "The radio future fund identifies and
11	supports initiatives to increase Public Radio's
12	listener and corporate support by about 60 to 100
13	million dollars annually within three years. It
14	encourages stations, producers, and related
15	organizations to increase productivity, operate more
16	efficiently through cooperative efforts, resulting in
17	significant annual savings, and to strengthen audience
18	services through programming."
19	In your understanding of how radio future
20	fund works, is that a fair description?
21	A It's a fair the numbers that were used
22	in fact, I objected to the numbers used because I

thought that CPB was establishing numbers that were 1 2 outside the realm of reality to radio. 3 The concept of the future fund is to 4 stimulate stations to do a better job, which is in a whole 5 range of areas from their fund-raising 6 capability to plan giving to major gift solicitation 7 to efficiency in operation and to better format focusing in their programming. 8 9 Well, in fact, though, is it not true that 10 NPR received in 1996 a sum in a project aiming to boost system-wide underwriting income by coordinating 11 12 multi-market underwriting sales and adding value to 13 underwriting? That's absolutely true. 14 15 Q By the way, I know I'm jumping around. And forgive me for that. 16 17 With respect to the PRI feeds -- well, let's ask about NPR first. When NPR charges its 18 19 members for programs, what's the basis for the charge? 20 Do they charge per capita? Do they charge by market 21 share? Do they charge by revenue? How do they 22 charge? How does NPR charge?

	A 1'11 be nappy to answer that.
2	Q Sure.
3	A And if you'll bear with me, I need to
4	throw a little bit of history in here that might help.
5	NPR for a number of years charged its
6	member stations on what it cost NPR to operate.
7	Basically it was: Well, last year we spent \$15
8	million. This year we want to spend \$16 million.
9	And, from what I have been told, annual membership
10	meetings were quite a sight to behold because it
11	became an annual negotiation between what NPR thought
12	it should charge and what the stations felt that they
13	could pay.
14	A number of years ago, and I believe it
15	was just over five years ago a new model was
16	established for a number of reasons. The model was to
17	base what NPR charged on total station revenue.
18	Total station revenue represents what a
19	station generates annually in three areas: nonfederal
20	financial support; community service grant from CPB;
21	and what is called the NPPAG grant, which stands for
22	National Program and Program Acquisition Grants.

1 So when you combine those numbers, 2 nonfederal financial support, the CSG, and the NPPAG 3 monies, that became your total station revenue. NPR charges stations a percentage of that total 4 5 station revenue on an annualized basis. 6 Now, this was done for a number 7 one, to buy peace in the system because it reasons: 8 was established under what we call a five-year 9 lock-down, where the percentage would stay the same 10 over five years. But, more than that, it was to establish 11 a fair basis for purchase. And it is not necessarily 12 13 the system we want to stick with all the time, and I'll get back to that soon. 14 15 But, just so you get a sense of what we 16 charge, we charge 11 and a half percent of total 17 station revenue for news and talk programming. 18 charge 2.1 percent for cultural programming. And the 19 only way we are able to charge 2.1 percent for 20 cultural programming is because we include Car Talk in 21 that package for cultural programming.

in

Talk

itself

Car

22

represents

approximately 70 percent of that charge, that 2.1 percent. So if you take Car Talk out, our real charge for cultural programming is approximately .6 of one percent.

It is our intention, even though this method of charging will continue for at least another year or two, to eventually shift more to a listener hour basis, which will really relate to the value of our programming, rather than what the program enables you to generate in terms of funding, which is the basis it's used now.

Q Have you done any calculation of what the -- have you figured out the cost of providing music to those stations for which you were getting this fee? In other words, in setting the fee for what you've described as cultural programs, -- and you've very, very eloquently indicated that Car Talk is a part of the package -- have you expensed out what it costs your production to sell that music for that price or haven't you done it?

A Well, there are two different -- what it costs for us to produce the show we know very well.

1.5

2.1

1	The cost of
2	Q What about the cost of using the music?
3	Had you factored that in?
4	A Cost of using the music.
5	Q You pay license fees, don't you? I guess
6	you don't. Have you figured out the cost of what CPB
7	pays in license fees in realizing your return for this
8	fee?
9	A We don't do it that way.
10	Q I see.
11	A There is no way we could charge a fee for
12	what it costs for us to produce cultural programming
13	okay? because the stations, quite frankly, would
L4	not pay for it.
L5	Q Well, but even if you were doing that
1.6	calculation or when you're thinking out what the price
L7	is of the fee, you don't consider at all a cost of
L8	what would be paid to the performing rights
L9	organizations, do you?
20	A Well, I think, as Mr. Downey said earlier,
21	the cost of the fee paid to the performing rights
22	organizations comes out if the money is given from

1	Congress to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting at
2	present.
3	And that comes off the top, which means
4	the CSG monies and the NPPAG monies, which the
5	stations received from the Corporation for Public
6	Broadcasting, would otherwise be increased had that
7	amount not come off the top.
8	There is an indirect relationship in what
9	they can pay us.
10	Q Have you and maybe you haven't. Have
11	you bothered to figure out whether there would have to
12	be an increase other than de minimis in the charges
13	you would be making to the member stations if the
14	proposals of ASCAP were accepted by this Panel?
15	A I have looked very briefly at the impact
16	on the Public Radio system were a 300 to 400 percent
17	increase be established for Public Broadcasting and
18	the impact on Public Radio. I think the impact would
19	be substantial on Public Radio.
20	Q How much would it be per station?
21	A See, that's a very hard way to look at it
22	because it's very different. The size of our stations

1 from market to market. The level of sophistication varies from market to market. 2 3 A \$1,000 increase or a fee charged to a 4 station in New York is unbelievably different than a 5 \$1,000 fee established or charged to a station in 6 rural Alaska. 7 I will tell you in my opinion that if hundreds of dollars or thousands of dollars were 8 9 attached to the fees that small rural stations would have to pay, they could not afford to pay it. 10 Ιt 11 would change substantially the nature of the Public 12 Radio system. And, in fact, it would change 13 substantially the universality of service as it exists 14 now. 15 Q Have you calculated what the impact of the fee would be if it was made proportional to the gross 16 17 revenue of each of the stations? 18 I have not specifically done that, no. 19 And that might make a difference, wouldn't 20 it? In other words, the larger revenue-producing 21 station would pay the lion's share of the fee 22 increase; whereas, the stations that have de minimis

1	revenue would presumably pay a proportionally de
2	minimis amount of their income.
3	A I wish I could respond favorably to that,
4	Mr. Schaeffer, but it is a small station. And we have
5	well over 100 the size of our station our member
6	station budgets is very different from the Public
7	Broadcasting Service. We have over 100 stations with
8	very small, extremely small budgets.
9	They get all of our programming just for
10	paying the annual membership fee of approximately
11	\$7,000. With that fee raised to \$7,500 or \$8,000, it
12	would have a severe impact on them.
13	Q Have you done
14	A You can't discount. We know from our
15	member stations that any additional fees, especially
16	at the lower levels, will severely impact them and
17	injure them.
18	Q These stations that couldn't afford the
19	additional four or five hundred dollars, they're
20	getting programs from other producers as well, aren't
21	they?
22	A Not necessarily. I mean, it depends on

	the station and in the market.
2	Q Okay. Well, let me ask you: Do you have
3	an understanding how your competitor, PRI, charges?
4	A Yes, I do.
5	Q How do they charge?
6	A Well, they're not a membership
7	organization. So they charge a fee for programming or
8	a fee for service. It's a whole it's a different
9	structure than we do.
10	They also do things in the marketplace
11	that we don't do. As an example, they have
12	exclusivity, where if you are broadcasting, if you're
13	one station chooses buy A Prairie Home Companion in
14	a particular market, then another Public Radio station
15	cannot access that show.
16	Q Well, is it a fact that their fees are
17	based on station revenues?
18	A I believe at present, they are, yes.
19	Q Are there any other producers that you're
20	aware of that are competitors with NPR that also
21	charge on the basis of station revenue?
22	A I do not know.

1	Q For example, you mentioned before
2	Classical 24. Do you know how they charge?
3	A That's distributed by PRI.
4	Q I see. And what about the Beethoven
5	whatever it was?
6	A I do not know how they charge. That's
7	distributed by WFMT.
8	Q Would you agree well, let's move on
9	because that was just argumentative.
10	MR. SCHAEFFER: Would you put before the
11	witness
12	JUDGE DREYFUS: While we're at a break,
13	while we're moving on to something else, a question.
14	News and talk was 11.5 percent of revenues for
15	membership fee, and there was another factor of 2.1
16	percent for cultural. Is that correct? Were there
17	any other factors besides these two?
18	THE WITNESS: Yeah. On the news/talk side
19	and I did leave this out. On the news/talk side,
20	what you're paying for for the 11.5 percent is
21	primarily the seven-day-a-week news magazines and the
22	newscasts.

1	If you choose to pay for a show like Talk
2	of the Nation, everything else in news/talk is a la
3	carte on top of that.
4	JUDGE DREYFUS: As a percentage of
5	revenue?
6	THE WITNESS: No. As a flat fee for the
7	program.
8	JUDGE DREYFUS: Okay.
9	THE WITNESS: On the cultural side, and
10	this is something I forgot to mention there is
11	actually a ceiling as to how much you can pay on an
12	annualized basis.
13	If you choose all of our cultural
14	programs, the maximum you can pay annually is \$23,000;
15	whereas, stations who buy news/talk and our news/talk
16	package, especially the larger stations, can pay
17	anywhere from 600 to 800 thousand dollars per year.
18	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
19	Q By the way, have you ever done an
20	analysis, again as a general group, of what it costs
21	to produce these so-called cultural programs, as
22	opposed to what it costs to produce these so-called

1.	news programs?
2	A Well, we know in our annual budget what we
3	budget for news programs. And I think that was within
4	my testimony.
5	Q Give us an approximation. In 1997, what
6	did you budget for news programs?
7	A Approximately we budgeted about \$24
8	million for NPR news, and we budgeted about
9	approximately \$5 million for NPR cultural.
10	Q Thank you.
11	MR. SCHAEFFER: Do we take a break at 3:15
12	or 3:30? I don't know. I'm not asking about I
13	mean, I don't care. I just didn't know if you wanted
14	me to go on to the next subject.
15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Unless someone
16	wants to, let's go to the
17	MR. SCHAEFFER: That's fine. Could you
18	put in front of the witness Exhibit 521.13? And I
19	think that will be ASCAP Exhibit 19X.
20	(Whereupon, the aforementioned
21	document was marked for
22	identification as ASCAP

1	Cross-Examination Exhibit
2	Number 19X.)
3	MR. RICH: Pardon me. What's this?
4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: 19X.
5	MR. SCHAEFFER: 19X, Bruce.
6	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
7	Q Would you look at 19X, which I believe is
8	an article from the now Current of May 27th, 1996?
9	Have you ever seen this article?
10	A I believe I have, yes.
11	Q Are you familiar with Current?
12	A Oh, yes. Yeah.
13	Q And I assume, like most people in your
14	industry, you read it religiously?
15	A Oh, no, I don't.
16	Q You read it irreligiously?
17	A Irreligiously, yes.
18	Q You do read it from time to time?
19	A I do read it from time to time.
20	Q Are you familiar with a reporter named, I
21	think it is, Jacqueline Conciatore?
22	A Conciatore, yeah.

1	Q And I believe, although I may be
2	corrected, the J. C. in this article is clearly her,
3	
4	A Uh-huh.
5	Q Current not having such a big staff?
6	A Yes.
7	Q I assume you know her to be a reasonably
8	reliable reporter or don't you?
9	A Yes, I think reasonably reliable is fair.
10	Q Okay. There's a gentleman named John
11	Sutton mentioned in here. Who is he?
12	A John used to be the head of audience
13	research for NPR.
14	Q Used to be. Is no longer?
15	A He is no longer. He has his own company.
16	Q What does audience research do?
17	A Works with our stations to well, it
18	does a number of things. One is to help stations and
19	NPR get a better understanding of who our audience is.
20	It also had within John's purview and perhaps most
21	importantly the on-air fund-raising partnership
22	between NPR and the stations, where we work with

1	stations to help them learn how to fund-raise over
2	their air.
3	Q Now, Mr. Sutton says, "In the past, we
4	have been" before I get to that just so it will
5	help me also, in the first paragraph, there's a
6	reference to PRC. What is PRC?
7	A Public Radio Conference. It's an annual
8	event that NPR puts on.
9	Q And is that a fund-raising event?
10	A No.
11	Q What kind of event is that?
12	A It's an annual conference for all our
13	stations.
14	Q I see. Now, Mr. Sutton says, "In the
15	past, we," and I assume that's NPR, "have been
16	producer-driven. Now we want to focus on day parts
17	and what the audience wants from radio."
18	Was that an accurate viewpoint of the NPR
19	policy-makers in 1996?
20	A What it's referring to I think is a little
21	bit more complex than the small words quoted in this
22	article.

1	Q Why don't you tell us?
2	A For many years the Morning Edition and All
3	Things Considered were considered to be what in the
4	Public Radio industry, we refer to as the tent poles.
5	Drive time in the morning, drive time in the
6	afternoon, the audience builds. And then between the
7	tent poles, it declines.
8	The stations had asked us to see if we
9	could lift up the middle of the day parts with more
10	news/talk programming that would hopefully keep more
11	listening for longer periods of time between Morning
12	Edition and All Things Considered.
13	Q Thank you.
14	Now, what is day-parting as a concept? Is
15	that a concept known to the radio industry at large or
16	just Public Broadcasting?
17	A I can't talk for the radio industry at
18	large, but day parts refer to certain times of the day
19	and certain listening habits. You know, drive time is
20	a day part.
21	We were trying to focus on those times

1	programming from NPR where we could serve the American
2	public by providing that programming.
3	Q And in 1997 and 1998, is movement toward
4	day-parting, which you say was instituted around this
5	time, continued as part of the Public Radio's
6	activities?
7	A As par of our analysis, there were two
8	significant voids in Public Radio programming: the
9	afternoon day part and the weekend afternoons after
10	the morning news magazines.
11	Q And just so I mean, I have to keep it
12	in mind. In this sense, NPR is playing two different,
13	as I take it, more or less discrete roles. Maybe it's
14	not discrete. One, you're a provider of programming.
15	And otherwise you're an adviser of the stations.
16	So to the extent that you're not dealing
17	with NPR programming as such and as an adviser of the
18	stations, I assume it's up to the station to follow
19	your suggestions or ideas. Is that correct?
20	MR. RICH: I have a form objection.
21	MR. SCHAEFFER: I don't know what's wrong
22	with the form, but I'm perfectly willing

1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: You state a number
2	of assumptions for which a foundation hasn't been
3	established. Rephrase it without using assumptions.
4	MR. RICH: Assumed roles for NPR, et
5	cetera.
6	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
7	Q Insofar as NPR recommends day-parting as
8	a device for the Public Radio stations, is that in
9	your capacity as counselor to the stations?
10	A That's not exactly what we do.
11	Q Well, tell me what you do.
12	A NPR as a membership service organization
13	and as a program producer tries to do what is in the
14	best interest of its membership and the American
15	public. If we feel that there is a void in the
16	programs being provided, either we'll try to produce
17	such a program or we'll try to acquire it.
18	We cannot mandate nor dictate what a
19	Public Radio station chooses to carry. That is all
20	done at the local level. We can advise, encourage,
21	cajole, but it is all a local decision.
22	And the Public Radio system is by no

2 programs when they choose to run the programs. I think you've made that clear. 3 0 4 Now, I notice in this article, there's a 5 session statement, "At а PRC on NPR cultural programming, some managers said they worry NPR is 6 7 giving music programming an increasingly shorter shrift. Nebraska Public Radio's Steve Robinson took 8 9 issue with NPR's February offer of a discount on 10 audience research to help stations evaluate the 11 probable outcomes of switching to all news formats. 12 'NPR seems to be encouraging stations to go all news,' he said. 13 14 "NPR cultural programming head Sandra 15 Rattley-Lewis responded that 'NPR concluded 16 development of the news/talk package before her 17 department was ready with all of its news service. 1.8 The network is devising program streams that will 19 serve news, music, homogeneous or mixed formats,' she 20 indicated. 'We have not abandoned our commitment to cultural programming." 21

stretch of the imagination a network. Stations run

Is that an accurate position of NPR as of

22

1

1	this time?
2	A Well, you have a number of mixed
3	representations in there.
4	Q Okay. Why don't you tell me what's right
5	and what's wrong?
6	A Well, certainly we've never abandoned our
7	commitment to cultural programming. Nor have we now.
8	We were only based upon information and interest,
9	we were encouraging we were not officially
10	encouraging stations to abandon one format for
11	another.
12	But what we were doing was saying this
13	format seems to work best on your station. Maybe if
14	you develop it further, you'll do a better job in
15	serving your audience.
16	There are many examples around this
17	country of stations that mix formats. And sometimes
18	when they do, it is at the expense of their audience.
19	Q What's a mixed format?
20	A I can give you I mean, there are many
21	stations that use a number of formats, but the primary
22	format in the Public Radio system is classical and

1	news.
2	Q Well, but you just used the word and
3	I'm curious about that. You just said something about
4	I thought mixed format. And she said, "That will
5	serve news, music, homogeneous or mixed formats."
6	That implies that some formats are homogeneous and
7	some are mixed.
8	Isn't that a fact that there are some
9	formats that are both music, talk, and news?
.0	A Yeah, there are some formats that are
.1	music, talk, and news.
.2	Q What would they be called in the system
.3	that NPR and Corporation for Public Broadcasting have
.4	evolved for classifying formats?
L5	A They would probably be called in most
.6	cases classical/news.
.7	Q They would be called classical/news?
.8	A Uh-huh.
.9	Q And, just for my own curiosity, in looking
20	at the now, where am I going to find these charts?
21	I apologize. As usual, I'm unprepared. Well, in the
22	chart in your testimony well, I don't know what it

1	is.
2	In the format carriage trends on Page 7 of
3	your direct testimony and in there's the program
4	information. No. I have the wrong one. It's Public
5	Radio programming Fiscal Year 1987 forward. There is
6	nothing in here I think about classical/news format.
7	MR. RICH: May we get a clarification of
8	what Mr. Schaeffer is referring to?
9	MR. SCHAEFFER: Exhibit 17.
10	MR. RICH: Thank you.
11	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
12	Q Let's look at Exhibit 17 because I may
13	have well, anyway, I'm not going to waste your
14	time. It's getting late. The document will speak for
15	itself. Don't answer the question. The document
16	speaks for itself. So don't.
17	There's reference in this ASCAP Exhibit 19
18	to something called the station consultation model.
19	It's on the second page, 14, and the first column. Do
20	you see that? It says
21	A No.
22	Q Okay. Let me read it to you. It says,

1	"All of these moves build on the success"
2	A Oh, this is the back of what you gave me
3	previously?
4	Q Yes. I'm sorry. It's the second page.
5	I don't know what I thought it was a separate page.
6	Forgive me on this. I apologize.
7	A Okay.
8	Q In the first column on the rear, in the
9	middle of the page, it says, "All of these moves build
10	on the success of NPR's ATC expansion using the same
11	station consultation model, NPR execs say."
12	So, for this layman anyway, would you tell
13	us what the ATC expansion is and what the station
14	consultation model is?
15	A Yes. Whenever we do or think about doing
16	a major shift in one of our national a change in
17	one of our national programs, where we have an idea
18	for a new program or we feel that something is
19	appropriate for the Public Radio system, we form an
20	advisory group in consultation with member station
21	managers.
22	This gives us a much better grass roots

sense of whether what we are thinking in Washington makes sense for the industry. For a number of years, the stations wanted us to make All Things Considered, ATC in this article, into a two-hour show, rather than a one-and-a-half-hour show, 90-minute show, and to move it to a 4:00 p.m. start on the East Coast, which after a long and protracted consultative process, we did a little over a year ago. 0 Okay. Thank you. Now I understand that.

And we'll leave this exhibit, but I have another question. If you look in the second column on what must be the rear side, 521.14, there's the statement. "NPR announced that if all the major broadcast networks agree to give the presidential candidates free air time, it will air their statements The messages would come during prime time. So stations on the East Coast would have to break format to air them."

Am I correct in understanding the Public Radio in May of 1996 took the position that it would only give presidential candidates free air time if the commercial stations did so as well?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	A I think what we've done, what we did at
2	this time, if my recollection is appropriate, we
3	wanted to make sure that there was consistency with
4	what NPR provided its constituency.
5	And if in this case, if the other major
6	we consider ourselves a major news organization,
7	national news organization.
8	Q And you certainly are.
9	A And that if the other major international
10	news organizations were going to be feeding that, we
11	would feed it as well.
12	Q But if they wouldn't, you wouldn't?
13	A We wanted there to be consistency across
14	the spectrum.
15	MR. SCHAEFFER: Do we want to take a break
16	now?
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: I would suggest we
18	do, Mr. Schaeffer. We can pick up
19	MR. SCHAEFFER: We'd better because messy
20	as I am already, I got even messier. I apologize.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: We'll give you a
22	chance to pick up your papers.

1	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off
2	the record at 3:36 p.m. and went back on
3	the record at 3:50 p.m.)
4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Mr. Schaeffer,
5	whenever you're ready, sir.
6	MR. SCHAEFFER: I'm ready, Your Honor.
7	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
8	Q I take it underwriting is payment by third
9	parties in connection with the production or
10	broadcasting of public radio programs? Is that a fair
11	definition?
12	A Underwriting is payment by third party for
13	an underwriting credit on a public broadcast show or
14	public radio show.
15	Q And at the present time in the public
16	radio system, is there both local and national
17	underwriting?
18	A Yes.
19	Q Would you explain to the Panel what the
20	difference is?
21	A National underwriting is a type of
22	underwriting that a national program, producer or

1	distributor would append to a program at either the
2	top or bottom of the hour. Local programming is that
3	type of underwriting that is sold by the local
4	distributing body, normally the local public radio
5	station.
6	Q So for example, you've testified that
7	approximately 25 percent of the broadcast hours on
8	public radio are attributable to NPR and NPR, I
9	assume, gets national underwriters and gives those
10	credits at the top and the bottom of the NPR program
11	or some segments of the program, is that right?
12	A We try to sell national underwriting where
13	we can for our national programs, yes.
14	Q And how do you sell that?
15	A We have a development department and the
16	development department works with corporations or in
17	some cases their advertising agency to see if they
18	will purchase some underwriting on our air.
19	Q And I take just as a question of
20	curiosity, do the people who sell the sell the time
21	to the underwriters, so to speak, or solicit the
22	underwriters, do they get paid on a commission basis?

1	A No, they do not.
2	Q And how but I assume the advertising
3	agencies work in their usual fashion, that is, they
4	get compensated based upon the placement or don't
5	they?
6	A I don't know.
7	Q You don't know. Now with respect to
8	are there certain rates that NPR charges, for example?
9	A We do not have a rate card, if that's what
LO	you're asking.
L1	Q Yes, how does one find out what one would
L2	have to pay in order to be an underwriter on an NPR
L3	program?
L4	A Normally, our development staff works with
L5	the corporation or the representative body for the
L6	corporation to design a package that would serve the
L7	corporation's needs and our interest as well.
L8	Q And so are you saying in each instance the
L9	underwriting price is negotiated with the individual
20	business underwriter? I'm talking about national, now.
21	A I would say the package is negotiated.
22	Q What do you mean by the package?

1	A Well, for instance, a corporate
2	underwriter might just want to purchase an
3	underwriting spot in Morning Edition or All Things
4	Considered. We would encourage them to do more than
5	that. That might include the contribution to NPR or
6	it might include working with us to support one of our
7	cultural programs. It might include a variety of
8	sponsorship opportunities including the Public Radio
9	Conference.
10	Q In connection with the solicitation of
11	underwriters is there, are there any market studies or
12	literature given to the underwriters explaining the
13	impact of what the announcement may or may not have
14	for the prospective underwriter?
15	A Yes. The underwriter is normally by our
16	development office given a package of materials that
17	describes NPR and also describes our stations and also
18	describes the public radio audience.
19	Q Well, we don't have it here, but when you
20	say there's description of the audience, what kind of
21	description? There are references to Arbitron or
22	local markets, big markets? Is there anything like

1	that discussed in the marketplace?
2	A It will also talk about the nature of our
3	audience and might, in some cases, refer to the
4	demographics of the audience.
5	Q And by demographics, I assume you would
6	mean income, age, things of that sort?
7	A Also avocation. It primarily deals with
8	the educational level and the avocations of our
9	audience.
10	Q What do you mean by demographics?
11	A Age, income, education level.
12	Q And is there any reference to things like
13	Arbitron in any of the literature or don't you know?
14	A I don't know.
15	Q Can you tell us relatively how much money
16	was achieved by national underwriting, let's say in
17	1997 by NPR?
18	A By NPR alone, I would venture to guess
19	somewhere in the neighborhood of \$8 million.
20	Q And with respect to non-NPR producers, do
21	you know how much was produced?
22	A No.

1	Q Do you have any understanding as to how
2	much the local station produced in 1997 in terms of
3	underwriting, I assume it's much bigger
4	A I truly don't know what that number is.
5	Q Now in connection with national
6	underwriting, is there a policy of encouraging common
7	carriage? You understand what common carriage is,
8	don't you?
9	MR. RICH: I would like to interpose an
10	objection first. There was no testimony elicited on
11	direct about underwriting practices, selling of
12	underwriting time, common carriage or any of these
13	areas. I've been patient, seeing how far Mr.
14	Schaeffer would go, but there isn't a scintilla of
15	testimony covering this area in this witness's direct
16	testimony.
17	MR. SCHAEFFER: Part of our argument is
18	that which walks like a duck, quacks like a duck and
19	looks like a duck, is a duck. We've been claiming and
20	I think it's no secret to anybody that the public
21	broadcasters of television and radio are now in a kind
22	of commercial entrepreneurial mode which makes it

1	appropriate for them to pay for our music as any other
2	business would or at least on the same levels of that
3	music. And therefore, it seems to me appropriate for
4	me in cross examining that witness to go into these
5	issues?
6	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: The objection is
7	overruled.
8	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
9	Q Let me go back. Do you have an
10	understanding, is there such an expression in the
11	broadcasting industry as common carriage?
12	A I think there is on the television side.
13	There is not anything that I know of in the radio
14	side.
15	Q All right, and the radio side is there a
16	word carriage?
17	A Certainly.
18	Q What does carriage mean on the radio side?
19	A It's when a station carries a program.
20	Q Now with respect to the broadcasting of
21	nationally underwritten programs are there any efforts
22	by NPR with respect to its programs to achieve

2 various affiliated stations? 3 Α I wish it were that easy in public radio. 4 We broadcast as an example for Morning Edition and All 5 Things Considered, we would hope the stations would 6 broadcast them at the appropriate drive time in their 7 market. Because we broadcast Morning Edition starting 8 at 5 a.m. on the East Coast, on the West Coast it 9 starts at 2 a.m. 10 Some stations will carry the programs 11 rolled over through drive time. Others in the market 12 may carry it for a certain amount of time and then 13 another station will pick the program up on a roll 14 over and carry it for an alternative length of time. 15 There is no consistency, if that's the best answer to 16 your question. 17 Is there any effort on the part of NPR to 18 achieve consistency, unsuccessful or successful? 19 Α In the best interest of the public radio 20 system, we would like there to be a little bit more 2.1 consistency throughout the programming schedule. But 22 I don't know of anything that we have done or has been

carriage at more or less the same times among its

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	tried that has succeeded at making them more
2	consistent.
3	Q And is it your testimony that there have
4	been no proposals made by NPR to its affiliated local
5	stations designed to encourage common carriage, as
6	I've described it?
7	A Again, common carriage is not the right
8	term. We certainly have encouraged our stations that
9	certain programs carried at a certain time will be
LO	more effective in serving their audience.
L1	Q Have you proposed any financial penalties
L2	or any financial rewards or any concessions or the
L3	contrary in order to achieve that consistency you've
L4	just described?
L5	A We encourage stations to take programs as
L6	fed and when we put together a package, let's say a
L7	news talk package that runs from 10 in the morning on
L8	the East Coast until 4 in the afternoon, we will
L9	discount it if they run it as fed in the a la carte
20	price.
21	Q I see, and what is the discount that
22	you're talking about?

1	A What is the discount?
2	Q How much is the discount?
3	A It might be 10 percent offer, 5 percent
4	offer. I'm not aware of the specific discount, but
5	yes, we will try to encourage them to do that but
6	quite frankly I don't think that has succeeded very
7	well.
8	Q Well, you tried to financially, by
9	financial needs is what I'm saying. It may not be
10	successful, but you try and give them a better price,
11	is that a fair comment?
12	A It's a fair comment. It's one of them.
13	Q We next put in front of the witness
14	something that has not been marked before. It's nine
15	pages. It comes, I believe, from our point of view of
16	the NPR web site. It would be ASCAP 20 for
17	identification.
18	(The document referred to was
19	marked for identification as
20	ASCAP Exhibit No. 20.)
21	I do intend to offer that in evidence and
22	I think I would move 19 in evidence.

1	MR. RICH: No objection to 19.
2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: To 19.
3	MR. SCHAEFFER: He hasn't seen 20 before,
4	Your Honor.
5	JUDGE GULIN: 19X is one of these that was
6	it's in evidence now?
7	MR. SCHAEFFER: I believe that's correct.
8	MR. RICH: If so, we would withdraw our
9	objection.
10	MR. SCHAEFFER: We hope we're pretty
11	close to what we agreed on.
12	JUDGE GULIN: Okay, so the motion to
13	strike this Exhibit 521 to 13 is withdrawn?
14	(Pause.)
15	MR. RICH: Although partially illegible,
16	we don't object.
17	MR. SCHAEFFER: If it's illegible, we'll
18	give you a cleaner copy.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right, ASCAP
20	Exhibit 20X is admitted.
21	(The document referred to,
22	having been previously marked

1	for identification as ASCAP
2	Exhibit No. 20 was received in
3	evidence.)
4	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
5	Q Have you read it?
6	A Oh yes, I'm well aware of this.
7	Q You say you're well aware of it and the
8	document by and large speaks for itself. I take it
9	these are a series of advertisements which NPR for the
LO	first time in 27 years is now engaging in. Is that a
11	fair comment?
12	A Yeah, but it's a little more complicated
L3	than that also. This
L4	Q Tell us.
L5	A This is quite frankly done through the
L6	support of the Ford Foundation. NPR, we feel very
L7	strongly, is probably the world's best kept secret.
L8	There is the only way people find out about NPR
L9	programming is by word of mouth or turning the radio
20	dial to the lower end of the spectrum mandated by
21	Congress for public radio and through the support of
22	the Ford Foundation, we were able to initiate this

1	effort to develop creatives to actually tell people
2	where NPR is and how to find us. This entire campaign
3	which I hope we can perpetuate is strictly done on
4	barter.
5	Q What do you mean by barter?
6	A Trade with the national magazines that are
7	featuring these advertisements in exchange for an on
8	air underwriting credit on NPR.
9	Q So that what in effect is happening is
10	Time, Harper's, Atlantic Monthly, Civilization and
11	Worth are getting spots on NPR, on NPR national
12	underwriting, I assume?
13	A That is correct.
14	Q In return for carrying this. Do you know
15	if the practice of barter is engaged in in the
16	commercial radio business?
17	A I do not.
18	Q Never heard about that before?
19	A I've heard of barter, but I don't have any
20	specific evidence of whether it's done.
21	Q Is anybody in your capacity as chief
22	operating officer of NPR ever said to you that you

1	know we barter time frequently and barter
2	announcements in the commercial radio programs?
3	A Nobody has ever said that to me, but I
4	certainly wouldn't doubt that it's done.
5	Q Do you ever read any broadcasting journals
6	other than those dealing with public broadcasting?
7	A I just read <u>Current</u> .
8	Q You only read <u>Current</u> ?
9	A I'm just kidding.
10	(Laughter.)
11	Q Do you read nonpublic broadcasting
12	material as well?
13	A Yes.
14	Q What are some of the nonpublic
15	broadcasting periodicals that you read?
16	MR. RICH: In the trade?
17	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
18	Q Yes, thank you.
19	A Beyond <u>Broadcasting & Cable</u> ?
20	Q Yes. I didn't know <u>Broadcasting & Cable</u>
21	was commercial.
22	A Well, that's one I read.

1	Q Anything else?
2	A I've read a variety of information.
3	Q And you've never seen the reference to
4	commercial radio bartering in any of those
5	periodicals?
6	A I'm sure I've seen the reference. I've
7	just never taken it to heart.
8	Q Okay. And certainly the fact that radio
9	stations and the commercial field barter time had
10	nothing, did not make any impression on you when you
11	engaged in this activity with <u>Time</u> , <u>Harper's</u> , <u>Atlantic</u>
12	Monthly, Civilization and Worth? Is that correct?
13	A It's the only way we felt that we could
14	effectively promote NPR.
15	Q That's not the question I asked you. I
L6	asked you whether the fact that you now apparently you
17	knew something about barter, whether that occupied any
18	withdraw it.
19	I think you've testified you may have seen
20	references to barter in commercial broadcasting in
21	some of the periodicals you read or am I wrong about
22	that? I'm sorry, if I am.

1	A I may have seen the reference to bartering
2	in a variety of magazines, periodicals.
3	Q And has it ever and are you testifying
4	that when this program was conceived and ultimately
5	implemented by NPR, weren't you aware that this was
6	the kind of thing that commercial radio stations
7	frequently do, namely barter their time for other
8	considerations?
9	A Actually, I don't think that was among the
10	basics or the principles behind the conception of this
11	plan. Our development officer for whom this idea came
12	felt that it was important to develop a mechanism to
13	gain exposure for NPR to attract people who wouldn't
14	otherwise know about us to turn to the lower end of
15	the radio dial.
16	Q How much I'm sorry. I apologize.
17	A And when she initiated this effort, I'm
18	sure she would have preferred for the Ford Foundation
19	to fund at such a level so we could have afforded to
20	purchase spots in magazines or newspapers, but
21	unfortunately that was not the case because of the
22	expense.

1	Q Well, it isn't going to cost you anything
2	out of pocket to give the credits, is it, to these
3	estimable periodicals?
4	A Well, there's a significant cost attached?
5	Q What is that?
6	A The cost is that an underwriting credit
7	that we might have otherwise been able to sell for
8	cash.
9	Q And with respect to the underwriting
10	credit that you might otherwise have sold for cash,
11	how many underwriting credits are you giving to these
12	periodicals?
13	A I don't know the exact number.
14	Q Do you have any idea of what the punitive
15	cost is, namely, is it like a million dollars worth of
16	NPR time, a \$100,000, what's the dimension we're
17	talking about here?
18	A I would estimate and this is just a guess
19	that it's hundreds of thousands of dollars.
20	Q By the way does NPR incur marketing
21	expense, NPR itself. I'm not talking about the public
22	broadcasting industry at large, that's something else

1	again. But NPR as an entity, does it have marketing
2	expense?
3	A Marketing expense for selling our
4	programs, yes.
5	Q And marketing expense in connection with
6	its other activities, namely okay, marketing
7	expense in connection with the selling of its
8	programs. Approximately what was that in 1997, do you
9	know?
LO	A My best guess would be somewhere between
11	100 and 250,000.
12	Q Does that include the barter we've talked
13	about or is that a 1998 figure?
L4	A That would be a 1998 figure and no, it
L5	does not include barter.
L6	Q Have you ever engaged in barter before
L7	other than that which is described in Exhibit 20?
18	A Not that I'm aware of.
L9	Q Next ask I put before the witness
20	something called Guidelines for Underwriting of
21	National Program Service Programs.
22	I think that will be ASCAP 21X.

1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: It will be marked
2	as Exhibit ASCAP 21X.
3	(The document referred to was
4	marked for identification as
5	ASCAP Exhibit No. 21X.)
6	(Pause.)
7	MR. RICH: No objection.
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Are you offering
9	it, Mr. Schaeffer?
10	MR. SCHAEFFER: I am indeed.
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Received without
12	objection.
13	(The document referred to,
14	having been previously marked
15	for identification as ASCAP
16	Exhibit No. 21X was received in
17	evidence.)
18	MR. RICH: Peter, you have the I'm
19	ahead of myself.
20	MR. SCHAEFFER: Am I distracting you?
21	MR. RICH: Not at all, go ahead.
22	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:

1	Q What do you have in front of you that
2	you're going through?
3	A The underwriting guidelines.
4	Q Okay, that's fine. Obviously, you're
5	familiar with these?
6	A Yes.
7	Q Do you have any particular role in
8	connection with the implementation or conception of
9	these guidelines?
10	A Very minimal.
11	Q Who has that responsibility at NPR?
12	A Our General Counsel Office, along with our
13	development staff, Director, Vice President and the
14	Board of NPR.
15	Q Do you have any understanding on the
16	degree to which these guidelines are binding or not
17	binding upon local stations carrying NPR programming
18	and carrying its own programming, their own
19	programming?
20	A They're binding upon the stations for the
21	use of national underwriting credits provided by NPR.
22	They are guidelines that we would hope that stations

1	might use on a local level for their own underwriting
2	efforts, but we don't have control over that.
3	Q Now with respect to the NPR programs that
4	are carried on public radio stations, what sanctions
5	are imposed upon those stations if they don't, if they
6	haven't complied with these guidelines?
7	A Okay, I need you to clarify the question
8	for me.
9	Q Please, I'd be glad to.
10	A Are these sanctions that are put upon the
11	stations by the FCC with regard to the station
12	carrying an underwriting credit which is inappropriate
13	or are you talking about if they don't follow what we
14	ask them to do.
15	Q Well, I assume, that's a fair question.
16	There are some items in this, I'm sure, and I know
17	that are FCC regulations and you don't have the writ
18	of seizure so I assume you don't enforce the FCC
19	regulations per se. The question though is if there
20	is any violation of a guideline either a guideline
21	that's in common with that of the FCC or your own
22	guideline, what are the sanctions?

MR. RICH: Could I ask through the Panel a clarification, whether Mr. Schaeffer is inquiring as to -- to use the word earlier you use the precatory part of these guidelines or the mandatory part of these guidelines?

MR. SCHAEFFER: Any part.

THE WITNESS: It's a very difficult question for me to answer.

BY MR. SCHAEFFER:

Q Tell me why.

2.

A Perhaps it would be better addressed to our General Counsel Office. I mean we expect the stations to follow our guidelines in reading our credits and they have a responsibility to do so. Similarly it's a consultative process where there is station representation with our management to make sure this is done appropriately and if it comes to our attention that a station is not doing what it should be doing, then we certainly send notice or give fair warning. But in terms of what we do if a station continually violates, doesn't carry our credits or covers them, I would be very hard pressed to think of

1	any instance when that has happened on a consistent
2	basis where a notice hasn't taken care of the
3	situation.
4	Q So as far as you're concerned you don't
5	you recall no case where a real sanction was imposed,
6	maybe because it wasn't because sanctions haven't been
7	deserved and these radio stations have been in
8	compliance?
9	A I don't recall at this point any sanction,
10	any such instance.
11	Q Do you recall that any particular stations
12	over the years of your administration had been
13	consistently called to your attention as a violator of
14	the NPR program service, NPR guidelines?
15	A I'm not aware of anybody on a consistent
16	basis.
17	Q Have there ever been any protests
18	indicated to you about the guidelines being too rigid
19	and being unfair?
20	A I guess my response to that is no, I don't
21	recall any communication to us that the guidelines
22	were too rigid or unfair. I'm just not aware of that

1	language being used.
2	Q Would you put in front of the witness a
3	document dated March 7, 1997 called Public
4	Broadcasting Report. This would be 22X.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: It will be marked
6	as ASCAP Exhibit 22X.
7	(The document referred to was
8	marked for identification as
9	ASCAP Exhibit No. 22X.)
10	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
11	Q And it's just for identification for the
12	moment.
13	(Pause.)
14	Why don't you look at or read to yourself?
15	(Pause.)
16	JUDGE GULIN: Just the first page of this?
17	MR. SCHAEFFER: I think the first page is
18	the most relevant. I think the second page, first
19	hand, but why don't we it's very hard to read
20	because it's single spaced. I'm well aware of that.
21	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
22	Q Let me ask a couple of questions about it.

1	First of all, have you ever seen this before?
2	A I don't remember this specific article.
3	I remember the instance.
4	Q By the way, just out of curiosity, is
5	there, have you ever read Public Broadcasting Report
6	or is that
7	A Actually I have, yes.
8	Q That's a periodical generally used in your
9	business. You say you remember this meeting on
LO	February 26 and 27 in Washington?
11	A Actually, I said I remember the article.
12	Q I'm sorry, I thought you said you
L3	remembered the meeting.
14	A I presume the February meeting was our
L5	Board meeting in February of last year.
L6	Q And do you recall that there was any
L7	discussion at that meeting concerning the relaxation
L8	of national underwriting rules?
19	A I recall that in the membership committee
20	which is one of the eight committees of our Board,
21	this was a topic that was discussed. I did not attend
22	that because I was in a different committee meeting at

1	that particular time, but I'm aware that this
2	discussion took place.
3	Q Did it come to your attention what the
4	subject matter of that discussion was? Would you tell
5	us?
6	A Well, the subject matter really related to
7	the fact that the FCC after a number of years had
8	relaxed its guidelines, I believe, to permit corporate
9	underwriters to use their slogan within the
LO	underwriting statement. And in this particular
LI	instance, Snap-E-Tools or whatever the name of the
L2	company was, their slogan, even though it wasn't
L3	accepted and approved slogan crossed the line as being
L4	qualitative, promotional. So we created the
L5	controversy as to even though it's an accepted slogan
L6	is what it says appropriate for use on public radio.
L7	Indeed, more recently this year we had something
L8	similar with <u>Time Magazine</u> .
L9	Q What was the issue in <u>Time</u> ?
20	A Their accepted slogan which appears on the
21	front page or the inside cover of <u>Time Magazine</u> says
22	"the world's most intelligent magazine."

1	Q And how was that resolved?
2	A We cannot use it.
3	Q With respect to this article and I don't
4	know if it's true or not, you'll have to tell me, was
5	there relaxation of NPR's rules in 1996, I guess it
6	would be?
7	A We began to accept corporate slogans,
8	corporate logos.
9	Q I see, so that was the relaxation that you
10	understand?
11	A That's correct.
12	Q That's referred to. Obviously, it's not
13	your statement.
14	Now, there also is a description which I'm
15	going to ask you whether or not it came to your
16	attention involving apparently something said by Ms.
17	Bennett. Do you know Ms. Bennett, the General Manager
18	of KWMU?
19	A Yes, I do.
20	Q And she is reported here as saying some
21	stations don't even air some national underwriting
22	spots and then goes on to say, apparently, all

1	stations must carry all underwriting as called for in
2	their contract, she said, before correcting herself
3	with membership agreement, NPR promises its
4	underwriters these spots will be aired, Bennett said,
5	and if some stations choose not to air them, maybe
6	they should be invited not to air NPR programming. Do
7	you remember that?
8 .	A I don't remember the specific statement,
9	but
10	Q I mean the substance?
11	A Yes, the substance.
12	Q And was there a dispute withdraw it.
13	Is it a fact that on occasions the stations ignore the
14	national underwriting?
15	A No, I think it's a very different process
16	than that. The stations are very quick to let us know
17	if they feel that something crosses the line. We try
18	to be scrupulous and indeed our standards are probably
19	at a higher level than our members stations because
20	if, in fact, we put on an underwriting credit which is
21	inappropriate or improper, it's the station or the
22	local market that's in jeopardy, not NPR. So we have

to be very careful how we do it and what we say.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

propose Therefore, if we national a underwriting some language in the national underwriting credit, that station а feels inappropriate, normally they'll come tell us and it becomes a dialogue, then our General Counsel's office has to make a decision whether it's something that we will insist that the stations carry or if something that we should look at again because maybe station is right in bringing this to our the attention.

It's a dialogue and I think very, very seldom have stations -- has a particular station chosen unilaterally not to air something without us knowing about it and realizing that there might be a problem.

Q But there have been, as you say, a number of occasions when stations -- well, withdraw it. It's not going to change anything.

Going on, you may not have read it yet on the next page and I'm just going to -- it's sort of a lead in, it says -- this article says "close to

1	station manager's pocketbooks was issues of dues,
2	status" I guess that's Bill Davis. Somebody, I
3	assume known to you is he a station person also?
4	A He was he is the head of WUNC at the
5	University of North Carolina.
6	Q Mr. Davis apparently said key issue is
7	that licensees must report all data for all stations
8	regardless of what they aired, so that NPR can better
9	assess due rates. Was there in this board meeting a
10	discussion of the dues that would be paid and the
11	better ways or worse ways of assessing dues on behalf
12	of NPR?
L3	A I would venture to guess, Mr Schaeffer,
14	that there isn't a Board meeting that passes when
15	there isn't a discussion of dues and programming fees.
L6	Q I see.
L7	A Mr. Davis was involved in his membership
18	committee which he chaired at that point in time, was
19	involved in a year-long dialogue and analysis with the
20	stations to see if another dues formula might be more
21	appropriate or applicable than the one based upon
22	total station revenue. That is what this is

_	referencing.
2	Q Okay. And ultimately, I take it, from
3	what I think you testified earlier was the dues are
4	still an on-going discussion at NPR?
5	A And will be in perpetuity.
6	Q I see. Okay. Now a little further down,
7	again referring to Davis, it says Davis headed
8	subcommittee on associate and auxiliary membership
9	categories, identified 259 associates, linked to 96
10	full NPR members with two thirds of associates full
11	repeaters. Associates are forbidden to receive CSGs.
12	Auxiliary stations don't meet NPR requirements for
13	staff numbers, budget, etcetera and pay only 25
14	percent for dues.
15	Now I assume this has something to do with
16	what you testified a little earlier, unfortunately
17	over my objection about other memberships. Is that
18	correct?
19	A That is correct.
20	Q All right, so maybe you can explain and
21	I'm sorry to burden you with this, but I'd like to
22	find out what it means.

What does it mean to say that there are 259 associates linked to 96 full NPR members and with two thirds of associates full repeaters?

A That means that of the 259 associates, those stations are getting from the 1996 full NPR members their programming, either repeating it or translating it, depending upon where they are and in what -- it's like for the lack of a better way of putting it, it is like a station, Wisconsin Public Radio is a group of stations with two primary stations in the Madison, Wisconsin area that serve another dozen or 15 stations throughout the state of Wisconsin.

Q So that the other stations, that is the non-Madison, Wisconsin station which is close to my heart since I come from there, I went there for a while, the non-Madison station just simply get the full programming, present them to their own local communities without any additional production costs or anything along those lines. They just repeat it, is that correct?

A It's not cut and dry. It varies by

1	community, but in most cases they will take what is
2	provided by that the home base station and in some
3	cases they will even abet that program with something
4	done on the local level, but most cases they're taking
5	the feed from that station.
6	Q I see. And then it says associates
7	which I assume are these kinds of people, stations
8	are forbidden to receive CSGs. What's CSGs?
9	A Community service grant. That's one of
10	the two types of grants that the Corporation for
11	Public Broadcasting gives to local stations, gives to
12	public radio stations.
13	Q Do you have an understanding as why they
14	don't receive those grants?
15	A No. Specifically I don't.
16	Q Is there any policy reason that you're
17	aware of for why they wouldn't be subsidized just as
18	anybody else would?
19	A I presume it relates to the Corporation
20	for Public Broadcasting's own rules and regulations.
21	Q Is there any, as far as you're aware, has
22	there been in recent years while you've been

1	associated with NPR a movement to eliminate certain
2	stations that don't reach certain staffing levels?
3	MR. RICH: Object to the form. I
4	certainly don't understand the meaning of the word
5	"eliminate"?
6	THE WITNESS: Yes.
7	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
8	Q Fine. Do these repeaters or whatever
9	they're called, the associate members get Corporation
10	for Public Broadcasting grants?
11	A Inmost cases I believe they do, yes.
12	Q And in your experience in the last three
13	years while you've been with NPR, isn't it a fact that
14	there has been a movement to eliminate these stations
15	as recipients of those grants?
16	A No, I would not put it that way at all.
17	Q Well, how would you put it?
18	A There has been a broad discussion,
19	frankly, stemming from the Corporation for Public
20	Broadcasting, examining a number of the issues that
21	relate to these small stations and their ability to
22	receive grants.

1	One of the issues and it's a significant
2	one is technology. Some stations feel that since they
3	have extremely limited resources that by reducing the
4	number of paid full-time staff or full-time equipment
5	I think is the term used in this, that they could more
6	efficiently replace a person with some technology
7	which would enable them to repeat programming. In
8	other words, after a certain hour you flip a switch
9	and the national programming feed takes over.
10	CPB has, I think, as its basis you must be
11	five full-time equivalents to receive community
12	service grant or to receive grants to be eligible for
13	CPB funding, so the discussion of the dialogue has
14	been should that number of full-time equivalents be
15	changed relevant to the advent of new technologies.
16	Q Are you familiar with KWMU(FM), KDHX (FM)
17	and WSIE(FM)?
18	A The only one off the top of my head that
19	I'm familiar with is KWMU which I believe is Ms.
20	Bennett's station in St. Louis.
21	Q Are you aware that it has been suggested
22	that their grants be substantially reduced by CPB?

1	A No, I'm not.
2	Q Excuse me a second. Are you aware that in
3	1996 the Corporation for Public Broadcasting put a
4	number of public broadcasting stations on notice that
5	the criteria to be eligible for funding would change?
6	A Yes, I am.
7	Q And what happened? Was the criteria for
8	funding changed?
9	A This actually led to the development of
10	the Future Fund which we alluded to earlier. There
11	were some stations that according to two standards and
12	I can't remember specifically what the standards were.
13	I think one related to listener sensitive income and
14	the other to size of audience.
15	There were a number of stations that by
16	these criteria established by the Corporation for
17	Public Broadcasting weren't performing. When I say
18	weren't performing, they just felt that the station
19	wasn't reaching it was like broadcasting to its
20	best friends, rather than to the public community. So
21	they established this criteria and in an effort to get
	l I

these stations to perform more effectively, Future

1	Fund was created to assist the stations in performing
2	more efficiently.
3	Q Incidently, does NPR for its membership
4	require stations to have a certain level of staffing?
5	A I believe NPR membership mirrors the
6	regulations established by the Corporation for Public
7	Broadcasting.
8	Q And what is that?
9	A I believe it's five full time equivalents
10	in terms of staffing.
11	Q So if you don't have five employees, you
12	can't be an NPR affiliate or member?
13	A That's correct
14	Q What other qualifications are there to be
15	an NPR member?
16	A There is a certain number of hours that
17	you need to be on the air on a weekly basis. I think
18	there's some sort of expectation with regard to
19	payment of employees. I'm not aware of all the
20	specifics, but the primary ones are the number of
21	full-time staff and the number of hours you broadcast
22	ner week

1	Q So NPR tries to make a line at which
2	stations which are too small can't become NPR members,
3	is that the idea?
4	A I don't think it relates to smallness as
5	much as it relates to professionalism and the ability
6	to serve your community.
7	Q Has there been any suggestion by some of
8	the NPR members that they would like to see the
9	associates eliminated because there's competition in
10	broadcasting the same shows or the same programs?
11	A Yes. Again, it's not specifically as you
12	phrased it. There is some concern with a station and
13	I'll use my Madison, Wisconsin there's a concern
14	that a station in Madison might put a repeater into
15	the Chicago suburbs where there is another local
16	station broadcasting. There's concern that then you
17	have one public station competing with another. And
18	even though they're on different frequencies. So that
19	has been the topic for discussion, but there's been no
20	resolution to that.
21	Q Why would that be a bad thing if All
22	Things Considered were produced by a lot of different

stations in concurrent jurisdictions. You're not a profit operation. What's the difference?

A The concern expressed by the stations I don't think have anything to do with profit. I think it more relates to fairness and equity. A station in Chicago market that might be paying NPR hundreds of thousands of dollars and provides Morning Editing and All Things Considered has a legitimate concern with another station plopping a stick or a repeater into that same market area that is paying significantly less to NPR based upon its total station revenue, in other words, a repeater station. It's more of a station versus station concern.

There are many, many markets around this country, L.A. and San Francisco and Washington, those are fine examples, where there's a multiplicity of NPR stations providing at some hours similar programming. But in general, most of the formats and stations, multiple stations in similar market are complementary formats. You have a classical station, a jazz station.

Q Thank you. I'm going to ask that Exhibit

1	312 be put before the Arbitrators and the witness.
2	The status of this, I think, it's so far been agreed
3	to be admissible subject to a qualification that's
4	disagreed to, namely the Public Broadcasters side.
5	It's only admissible as illustrative or authority for
6	Mr. Unmacht, but not on its own. Is that fair?
7	MR. STEIN: That's correct.
8	MR. SCHAEFFER: And I'm not offering the
9	other exhibit in evidence. I think it's just
10	cluttering the record. That's the previous one that
11	I did.
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right, ASCAP
13	Exhibit 312X is
14	MR. SCHAEFFER: It's 312. It continues to
15	be 312. There's no point in remarking it.
16	(The document referred to was
17	marked for identification as
18	ASCAP Exhibit No. 312.)
19	JUDGE GULIN: I thought it was withdrawn.
20	MR. SCHAEFFER: So far only to the extent
21	
22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Only to the extent

1	liac it's illustrative of what?
2	MR. SCHAEFFER: I didn't say it.
3	MR. STEIN: It's a document which was
4	purportedly relied upon by Dr by Mr. Unmacht, but
5	not for the truth of the matter is asserted.
6	MR. SCHAEFFER: It's our position having
7	been used by Mr. Unmacht, he and himself is the
8	sponsoring witness for it to go into evidence and we,
9	of course, disagree. I would move it in evidence now
10	or I'm going to ask some questions about that anyway.
11	So why don't I wait until I ask the questions. Then
12	I'll move it in. Maybe that will reassure them about
13	the objection.
14	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
15	Q Will you look at 312? It's this big fat
16	book and I don't expect you to read it off the stand.
17	Have you ever seen this before?
18	A Yes, I have.
19	Q Will you tell us what it is?
20	A I think, if I remember correctly, and I
21	haven't looked at it in a long, long time. It's a
22	guidebook that was developed through a grant from the

1	Corporation for Public Broadcasting geared to help
2	advise stations on how to do things a little bit
3	better in soliciting corporate support.
4	Q Now the document itself at page Roman
5	numeral XIII says that copies were distributed to each
6	CPB qualified radio station. Is that your
7	understanding as well?
8	A That is indeed what it says, yes.
9	Q Do you have any reason to dispute that?
10	A No.
11	Q In fact, are you aware that this is still
12	on the bibliography of the web page of CPB? It's
13	offered to members?
14	A I'm not aware of that but I don't doubt
15	that to be fact.
16	Q This is a document that circulated, as far
17	as you know still on your constituency, isn't it?
18	A I believe so.
19	Q I'm going to offer it into evidence now.
20	I don't think there's any qualifier.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: It will be received
22	as ASCAP Exhibit 312.

MR. RICH: There is an objection. I'm not aware that anything that was just testified to alleviates the objection. This is a multi-hundred page document. I have no idea the specifics for which it's being offered. It contains purported data, purported strategies. It was not authored by us. Not authored by any of the stations. It was authored by a third party. It's a classic example where I haven't the foggiest idea of what it is that Mr. Schaeffer proposes is relevant about this document other than to use it for whatever, we will learn, in post-trial briefing, I suppose, the snippet he wants to take out of it. It seems to me that among other things the purpose of 351.45 on documentary evidence indicates an intention that when you have a document of such length that a burden be placed on the proffering party to identify relevant portions of it. So we have some idea of what it's about. I haven't a clue of what to do with a

document like this and therefore our objection stands.

MR. SCHAEFFER: Mr. Unmacht testified at

7

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	

22

considerable length, I thought, and I know he did -not thought -- I know he did as to what this document indicates about the solicitation of what he described as people functionally equivalent to advertisers by the radio industry. Indeed, he made some admiring comments that this was a handbook for that kind of solicitation. It comes under the auspices, we've already heard of the CPB. It's distributed to the local members and the reason it's offered is because it's all relevant. The reason it's all relevant, I'm trying to prove here, I think, I may not succeed, that will be up to you gentlemen, but I'm trying to prove that the way the public broadcasting and in this case public radio does business is functionally equivalent in many respects to the commercial radio industry and it's therefore appropriate to use the commercial rates as a method of figuring out what the rates should be. It's not 100 percent, but it should a take off from that. And that's why I'm offering it and I think it's clearly relevant and I think anybody who reads this document and I can't believe Mr. Rich, if he tells me he doesn't, I believe it, but I'm sure somebody at

Weil, Gotshal must have read this to see exactly what it is. At least, all you have to do is read the first five pages and you an see it's a guide book to soliciting underwriters from the first page to the last page.

MR. RICH: As Mr. Weiss said when he was with us, had we literally read every piece of paper proffered by ASCAP we would still be in the back room reading.

We did not read every page of this because we didn't feel it was our burden to. There's no testimony in evidence, whether from this witness presently here or Mr. Unmacht or anybody else, as to what use, if any, a radio station makes of this document. This is a piece of paper that apparently has been sent out. We have no idea what, if any, use is actually made to it and nobody competent to draw that linkage to a proffered document written by a woman named Linda K. Liebold who I haven't seen in this room, don't know anything about, don't know her expertise or qualifications. We have no idea what use this has been made of in the industry. Mr. Schaeffer

1	will undoubtedly use this document in its post-trial
2	briefing as an alleged manual for, I suppose or
3	template for how quote the public radio industry goes
4	about soliciting business and corporate support.
5	There's nothing in the record that would
6	suggest as much.
7	JUDGE DREYFUS: Would this witness know
8	the extent in which this document had been used by the
9	radio stations themselves?
10	MR. RICH: I haven't heard Mr. Schaeffer
11	ask that question.
12	MR. SCHAEFFER: I'll ask him that
13	question, but he's already said that he knows
14	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Wait just a minute,
15	Mr. Schaeffer. Mr. Kleinberg had his hand waving.
16	MR. KLEINBERG: Can I just say, I do want
17	to note on the acknowledgement paid which is little i
18	page of the document there is a thank you to the
19	Corporation for Public Broadcasting for fully funding
20	the business and corporate support success project.
21	And then it goes on to a very special thank you to the
22	following public radio development professionals who

1	took the time to share their experience and expertise
2	by writing articles for this guide. They then
3	identified various people affiliated affiliations
4	indicating various stations and also two people that
5	I've seen with NPR in Washington, D.C. If one just
6	casually peruses the document you will see it as a
7	collection of articles written by these people and
8	that is what it is. So I think in terms of its
9	authenticity and its appearance and everything else,
10	it is exactly what the witness testified it was.
11	MR. SCHAEFFER: Moreover, he just said
12	it's still be distributed to the stations. Well, it's
13	obvious what it's for. It says what it's for.
14	MR. RICH: If I may, Your Honors, there
15	is, in my simple mind, a distinction between the
16	document that may be shipped to 600 or more stations
17	and the issue of what use, if any, to which it may be
18	put about which I've heard no questioning of this
19	witness in response to Mr. Dreyfus's suggestion.
20	JUDGE DREYFUS: Also, what's the date of
21	the document?

1994.

MR. SCHAEFFER:

1	JUDGE DREYFUS: 1994?
2	MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes.
3	MR. KLEINBERG: Your Honor, the date of
4	the document is 1995. It refers to a study that was
5	done in 1994.
6	MR. SCHAEFFER: I'm sorry. Thank you.
7	MR. KLEINBERG: If you look at various
8	pages like Roman 259, it's copyrighted at the
9	University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1995,
10	I mean throughout there are references to the time
11	period of 1995. It refers on the face of the study
12	MR. SCHAEFFER: Let me ask a couple of
13	questions I thought I had elicited this before.
14	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
15	Q This is still being distributed on request
16	to the radio stations, isn't it?
17	A I don't know. I answered before, you
18	asked me if it was on the web site at CPB. I have no
19	reason to believe it's not.
20	Q I thought you had testified before, the
21	record will say, I asked you isn't this something
22	that's distributed even now and still in print to the
	1

1	CPB qualified station and I thought you had said yes.
2	I may be wrong.
3	A That's not a question that I was asked and
4	I didn't respond to that because I don't know.
5	JUDGE GULIN: He may have said something
6	along the lines of "I assume so" if you recall the
7	question.
8	MR. SCHAEFFER: I have to say CPB is a
9	party to the proceeding. This is a document prepared
10	under CPB's auspices.
11	We've already had Unmacht testify about
12	it. I can't subpoena Ms. Liebold. The thing is a
13	guide, obviously, to solicitation. It's up to them to
14	say it's not being used. I can't prove its use or not
15	use. How could I?
16	MR. RICH: Your Honors, I didn't know we
17	had a guilty until proven innocent presumption in this
18	proceeding. That's pretty much tantamount to what I'm
19	hearing from Mr. Schaeffer.
20	MR. SCHAEFFER: I'll tell you what, Mr.
21	Rich, why don't you bring one of your stations in and
22	I'll ask them if they're using it.

1	MR. RICH: I'll address my comments to the
2	Panel.
3	MR. KLEINBERG: May I ask a question in
4	the nature of Voir Dire of the witness?
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Yes.
6	VOIR DIRE
7	BY MR. KLEINBERG:
8	Q Do you know a person by the name of
9	Jacqueline Nixon who may have occupied the position of
10	Associate Director of Audience Research at NPR?
11	A Yes, I do.
12	Q And you testified about that, are you
13	aware that Ms. Nixon wrote an article appearing at
14	page Roman 3
15	MR. SCHAEFFER: Well, she's got an
16	acknowledgement of the page.
17	BY MR. KLEINBERG:
18	Q Her article is entitled "Presenting and
19	Prospecting: A Guide to Research for Effective
20	Underwriting."
21	Is she still with NPR?
22	A She is still with NPR as our Director of

1	Audience Research.
2	JUDGE DREYFUS: Does she report to you?
3	THE WITNESS: She does not report to me,
4	no.
5	JUDGE DREYFUS: Indirectly? I mean is she
6	in one organization that reports to you? You're the
7	CLO, right?
8	THE WITNESS: No, she reports to the CEO
9	directly.
10	JUDGE DREYFUS: Directly?
11	THE WITNESS: Yes.
12	BY MR. KLEINBERG:
13	Q And do you know an individual by the name
14	of Lenore Tuttle-Wilkas?
15	A I knew Ms. Wilkas. She's no longer with
16	NPR.
17	Q She was until when?
18	A She left NPR soon after I arrived.
19	Q Was she the Associate Director for
20	Development at NPR?
21	A Yes, she was.
22	Q And that area was for getting funds,

corporate underwriting, development, that's what that 1 office was about? 2 Yes. 3 Α 4 I offer it again. MR. SCHAEFFER: just offer the 5 JUDGE GULIN: Let me 6 following comment. I think what I'm hearing, there's 7 really no serious argument as to the genuineness of 8 this document. I don't think there's any serious 9 argument that this is a document produced by CPB and at least made available to the radio stations. There 10 11 is some controversy as to whether it was actually used 12 by the radio stations, but Mr. Rich, is it at least 13 probative as to the mindset of CPB? 14 MR. RICH: I don't believe there's any 15 such testimony. All we know is that it was funded by 16 CPB. I don't know that Mr. Unmacht certainly wouldn't 17 know what was CPB's motivation. The Panel is welcomed 18 to inquire of Mr. Schaeffer or anyone of this witness, 19 whether he knows CPB's motivation and 20 importantly, we don't know to what use, if any, it's

NEAL R. GROSS

I'm not challenging the authenticity of

been put.

2.1

1	the document as a document showing relevance, sent out
2	to the industry, but that seems to me scarcely to
3	permit the conclusion or the judgment which ASCAP
4	apparently would lead to which is this is a template
5	for the industry in going out and soliciting money.
6	We don't know if it's been used and for
7	what extent it's been used for that purpose.
8	MR. SCHAEFFER: The web site at CPB has
9	been agreed to be in evidence in this case. There's
10	no dispute about that. This is listed in the web site
11	as being available to the stations today. That's how
12	we got
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: The web site has
14	been agreed to be?
L5	MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes.
L6	MR. RICH: I don't know what that means.
L7	MR. SCHAEFFER: You would concede whatever
1.8	the exhibit is, Exhibit 313 is admissible, Mr. Rich.
19	Exhibit 313 has a bibliography attached to
20	it stating what is available to the stations that are
21	affiliated with CPB. That's this. It says so.
22	MR. RICH: Al right. We have tried in

We have said we

good faith and very carefully and I really find it 1 2 difficult when Mr. Schaeffer attempts to misportray 3 things of this nature. We've looked at every document 4 proffered by Mr. Grajeda, all hundreds of them and where on a web site or otherwise, generated on a piece 5 6 of paper or on a telephone slip for that matter, there 7 is CPB or PBS or NPR authorship. 8 would withdraw our objection to the admissability of 9 all of those documents. Where, however, in a limited number of cases and 312 is one of them there's a 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18

document authored principally at least by nonparties to this proceeding or anybody associated with them, then we have no basis for knowing or certainly it's not in the nature of an admission. We have no basis for knowing the reliability of it and again at the risk of repeating, we have nothing in evidence to show the manner, if at all, in which this document has been used by the stations themselves. MR. SCHAEFFER: Two points. They're paying for something. They must be doing it for a Secondly, all of the articles are written by reason. people we've identified as with stations that are

19

20

21

1	being represented by these people in this proceeding.
2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right.
3	MR. SCHAEFFER: Of every single one of the
4	articles, sir, is written by somebody maybe there's
5	three or four exceptions, virtually every article is
6	from somebody from one of the qualified stations.
7	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right, let me
8	just inquire about a logistics matter.
9	MR. SCHAEFFER: Sure.
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: How much longer do
11	you intend to cross examine?
12	MR. SCHAEFFER: I have another 45 minutes.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: And then Mr.
14	Kleinberg, you're going to cross?
15	MR. KLEINBERG: I don't have very much.
L6	I would say under a half hour.
L7	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: You're going to
18	Redirect?
19	MR. RICH: As necessary.
20	JUDGE GULIN: So that's already up to two
21	hours plus.
22	MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes.

1	JUDGE GULIN: So it's unlikely we can
2	finish this witness.
3	MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes.
4	JUDGE GULIN: I think rather to attempt to
5	be expedient, why don't we adjourn. We will meet and
6	make a decision with respect to this. I think we've
7	heard you both on it and advise you first thing in the
8	morning. And we'll pick it up right from there.
9	MR. RICH: Thank you.
10	MR. SCHAEFFER: Thank you. 9:30 or 10?
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: What's more
12	convenient for you?
13	THE WITNESS: It really doesn't matter.
14	Either is fine. It's up to you.
15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: You're a big help.
16	THE WITNESS: If it was my choice I'd
17	probably go for 9:30.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: 9:30 it is.
19	Take care.
20	(Whereupon, at 4:55 p.m., the hearing was
21	recessed to reconvene tomorrow, Wednesday, April 1,
22	1998 at 9:30 a.m.)

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript in

the matter of: Hearing: Adjustment of the Rates for

Noncommercial Educational

Broadcasting Compulsory License,

Docket No. 96-6 CARP NCBRA

Before: Library of Congress

Copyright Arbitration Royalty Panel

Date: March 31, 1998

Place: Washington, DC

represents the full and complete proceedings of the aforementioned matter, as reported and reduced to typewriting.